

275084

JPRS-UIA-87-032

8 JULY 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

International Affairs

19980610 023

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 6

10
66
A04

8 JULY 1987

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

SOVIET UNION INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

International Relations Institute Rector Refutes 'Elitism' (R. S. Ovinnikov Interview; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 8 May 87)	1
Review of Journal 'WORLD ECONOMY' No 5, May 1987 (Zagladin, et al.; APN DAILY REVIEW, 13 May 87)	3

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

Table of Contents: AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 3, 1987 (AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87)	6
Review of the Journal AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 3, 1987 (APN DAILY REVIEW, 2 Apr 87)	8
U.S.-Japan-S. Korea Alliance Source of 'Tension' in Far East (A. Vorontsov; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87) ...	11
U.S.-Japan Cooperation in Military Technology, SDI Assailed (V. Yakovlev; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87)	17
Problems of Capitalist Path of Development Analyzed (G. Mirskiy; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87)	23
Multi-National Corporations' Types of 'Exploitation' Outlined (V. Shitov; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87)	33

Book on Relations Between Capitalist, Developing States (A. Kovalevskiy; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87) .	39
Handbook on State of Israel Reviewed (V. Isayev; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87)	41
Two Bulgarian Books on Arab Society, Religion Reviewed (N. Yonkov, Yordan Peyev; AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 3, Mar 87)	43
UNITED STATES, CANADA	
U.S. Right-Wing Offensive Smacks of 'McCarthyism' (N. Kurdyumov; PRAVDA, 8 Mar 87)	45
WEST EUROPE	
West German, Armenian Cities Establish Ties (KOMMUNIST, 6 May 87)	48
Swiss-Soviet Trade Decline, Prospects (MOSCOW NEWS, No 22, 7-14 Jun 87)	50
EAST EUROPE	
Briefs New Avtoeksport Center in Budapest	52
CHINA, EAST ASIA	
Asia-Pacific Forum Meets in Tokyo (TASS, 27 May 87)	53
NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA	
USSR Views Indian Political Scene, Supports Congress (I) Party (V. Skosyrev; IZVESTIYA, 8 May 87)	54
Briefs Trade Unionists in Alma-Ata	58
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	
Deputy Minister Adamishin Expounds Soviet Policy on Africa (A. L. Adamishin Interview; IZVESTIYA, 24 May 87)	59

/9986

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS INSTITUTE RECTOR REFUTES 'ELITISM'

PM131129 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 87 p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Historical Sciences R.S. Ovinnikov, rector of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Moscow State Institute of International Relations, by A. Baranov and Ye. Ovcharenko: "We Don't Need Milkops!"--no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Excerpts] "How does one become a diplomat?" No, this question sounds rather pretentious and feckless. This was why we did not ask Doctor of Historical Sciences Richard Sergeyevich Ovinnikov, rector of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Moscow State Institute of International Relations [MGIMO] to answer it. We asked him to describe the life at this VUZ, which trains international studies specialists in the spheres of history, law, economics, and journalism, under the conditions of new demands made of higher education by the time.

[Baranov/Ovcharenko] Richard Sergeyevich, the first step toward the VUZ is through the admissions commission. Entrance examinations are just around the corner, and some of our readers are interested in the rules governing admission to the institute. So, where can they obtain the relevant information?

[Ovinnikov] Until quite recently we were being very severely criticized, and it was justifiably pointed out that healthy competitive principles were virtually absent from the entrance examination process. We therefore decided to introduce radical changes in the work of admission commissions.

I think I am right in saying that last year we succeeded in ensuring proper and extremely objective conditions for competition by all candidates without exception.

Let's look at last year's figures: About one-half of those enrolled for the first course (46 percent to be exact) were workers and rural working people, and 52 percent of entrants were people with a production background or former Soviet Army servicemen. Some 30 percent were from outside Moscow. CPSU members account for one-third of those admitted to the institute.

Let me anticipate your next question: How about the children of senior officials from various departments? This category of persons accounted for only 5 percent of the total number of persons admitted. They all took their examinations properly, and those who displayed a high standard of knowledge were enrolled for study at the institute on the basis of an overall assessment.

As for the rules and conditions governing admission to MGIMO, I would advise your readers to refer to the April issue of the journal MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN and the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education handbook. They will find the information they need there. But I can say this right away: This information specifically states that preference in admission to the institute is given to persons from among the ranks of workers and kolkhoz members.

[Baranov/Ovcharenko] Active restructuring of all higher education is under way. To what extent has it affected MIGMO, and what is the path followed by your VUZ?

[Ovinnikov] Restructuring was launched at full speed in our VUZ following the 27th CPSU Congress. Of course, problems do exist in the teaching and educational process. Perhaps the main one (to be encountered, by the way, in all our higher education schools) is that of insufficient depth of study. Let me give just one specific example. For many years the study of history in our institute began from 1917; the framework of the teaching process left out entire epochs, and yet our VUZ trains specialists in the sphere of the history of international relations and experts on particular countries. It may sound paradoxical, but it is a fact: Their education within the program's framework was impermissibly fragmented and superficial, in other words, blank spaces were deliberately built into it. Now we have expanded the program's framework--the teaching of history begins from the period of the great French Revolution--although these are, of course, only the initial steps. A specialist who lacks sufficient knowledge is no specialist. And yet such blank spaces could be found in literally all departmental programs.

We are striving to give more time to our main disciplines: the history of international relations, international law, international economic relations, and information-propaganda work abroad.

We give much attention to the labor education of our students, especially bearing in mind the criticism claiming a certain "elitism" in MGIMO. We are against bringing up milkshops. Labor is just as valuable an element of the teaching program. We have also succeeded in achieving good indicators along this avenue: Last year, for example, students from our institute joined a construction detachment in Tselinograd Oblast and gained first place among the students construction detachments, outpacing even Moscow State University.

The problem of improving the quality of teaching is also rooted among us teachers. By no means all of us are capable of restructuring ourselves and of stressing to the utmost the creative principle in our work.

/9738

CSO: 1807/335

REVIEW OF JOURNAL 'WORLD ECONOMY' NO 5, MAY 1987

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 13 May 87 pp 1-4

[Article under rubric "Scanning Periodicals": "Review of the Journal 'Mirovaya Ekonomika i Mezhdunarodnye [sic] Otnoshenia [sick]' No 5, 1987." The texts of the articles by Zagladin and Utkin and excerpts from the article by Dmitriyev will be published in JPRS UWE-87-009 (USSR Report: WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, No 5, May 1987).]

[Text] The issue opens with an article "Party--People--Socialism" by V. Zagladin. The leading role of the Party forcefully manifested itself in the resolutions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and of the subsequent Plenums of its Central Committee, the author writes. Perhaps, the comprehensive importance of the turn will be appraised later, when its practical consequences become fully visible. But today it is clear that a cleaning storm is sweeping this country, carrying away everything which is alien to socialism and which hampers its progress, and creating an atmosphere of constructive work by really all people.

The period after the April 1985 Plenum became a time of a critical analysis of the way passed--an unbiased, deeply objective and fearless analysis. Even our closest friends sometimes ask us why we are now laying so much emphasis on criticism. There are two reasons for this, V. Zagladin stresses. The first lies in the fact that we will fail to resolve the existing problems if we do not determine their origin and character exactly. The second reason is that we will be unable to make headway in the future, too, if we do not firmly establish a critical and self-critical approach to all our actions in our society. Herein lies the guarantee against repetition of the errors of the past. We regard criticism, self-criticism and openness as the most important methods of making our policy more effective. They can by no means asperse or annul the Soviet people's achievements. These really gigantic achievements made it possible to boldly adopt a realistic analysis of our problems. Having become strong, Soviet society has also become more courageous.

Further, the speculations by the Western press that our criticism is directed against some persons but not against phenomena are groundless. We criticize shortcomings and errors, specific adverse phenomena in the life of society. Naturally, the responsibility of the political leaders is stressed in this

criticism. But, as it was said in no uncertain terms at the January Plenum, we mean the responsibility of all, including those who are now members of the Party's highest organs. Last but not least, our criticism is highly constructive. Each critical remark is accompanied by specific conclusions and proposals aimed at not only remedying the situation but also ensuring substantial progress of society, its further comprehensive development.

Our country entered the 20th century in the conditions of the ripening revolution, V. Zagladin writes in conclusion. It is approaching the 21st century as the homeland of socialism, as a mighty creative force which has proved that socialism is the genuine alternative to capitalism and that it gives real and weighty replies to the challenges of our epoch.

"On the Issue of Widening NATO Activities"--this is the title of an article by A. Utkin. Present-day imperialism tries to find means and methods of struggle against the revolutionary changes of our epoch, against the peoples' striving for independent development and social and economic progress, the author says. What are the prospects of NATO's evolution towards a wider geographical zone of its operation? It is difficult to give an unequivocal answer to this question. The bloc's main country--the United States--actively urges its West European confederates to assume new obligations, to include new areas bordering on the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean into its "sphere of responsibility." The West European members of NATO regard these ideas warily, fearing to follow the adventurist line of American imperialism. But the negative stand of the West European part of the North Atlantic alliance is no longer homogenous. At least two countries--Britain and France--preserve considerable ambitions and military presence outside the North Atlantic region. While in the past they acted "east of Suez" and in Africa on their own, today the striving for certain coordination of actions of the main Western powers is visible in the British and French stance. But it is a rather long way from this desire to a coordinated policy. The interimperialist contradictions hamper the implementation of the plans of those who stand for "globalising" the sphere of NATO's operation.

"Peace in the Middle East--Utopia or Reality" is an article by Y. Dmitriyev. Developments in the region, the author writes, invariably highlight some or other aspects of the overall problem of a Mideast settlement, as if to corroborate that it is too tricky and sophisticated. Against this background it becomes increasingly evident that the Soviet bid to settle all aspects of a settlement peacefully and promote a constructive, long-term and internationally sanctioned resolution of all disputable issues in the Arab-Israeli relations is a policy of principle. The Soviet proposals for a Mideast settlement are acceptable to all sides involved in the conflict, because they are well balanced and based on the principle of justice for all.

A Mideast settlement will be achieved, Y. Dmitriyev writes, as soon as all sides involved in the conflict realize that the volatile situation in the region may at any moment become uncontrollable, because the arms race in which more and more states in the region participate grows increasingly dangerous threatening to bring to naught every effort to normalize the situation in that party of the world.

Peace in the Middle East may become a reality, if the Israeli leadership abandons its policy of expansion and war with regard to its Arab neighbors. A Middle East settlement will become achievable, if the region stops being a military and political bridgehead of the United States and a place where Washington tries out its power politics methods in foreign policy, and if Washington ultimately realizes that the honoring of the basic international legal acts it has signed is crucial to safeguarding its prestige in the eyes of the countries of the region, and that the growing wave of anti-Americanism in the Middle East is a result of the hopelessly discredited U.S. neocolonialist policy, rather than of the "Kremlin's intrigues." A genuine peace in the Middle East will become easier to achieve when Washington realizes that without Soviet involvement in the peace process all settlement plans, even the most sophisticated ones, will go on bursting like soap bubbles, that the durability of Soviet political positions in the region and popularity of Soviet foreign policy moves there are due to the USSR's invariable principle to take into account the national interests of all states and peoples of the region.

The magazine also carries the first in a series of articles under the general title "Modern Capitalism and Uneven Development" by Y. Stolyarov and Y. Khesin, a piece entitled "The Human Factor at the Current Stage of the Scientific and Technological Revolution and Contradictions of Capitalism" by N. Ivanov, an article called "Third World Choice of Development Way and Orientation. Some Aspects of the Problem" by G. Mirskoy, etc.

/9274

CSO: 1812/229

TABLE OF CONTENTS: AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA NO 3, 1987

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 p 1

THE 27TH CPSU CONGRESS AND THE LIBERATED COUNTRIES

For Peace without Nuclear Weapons and Violence 2
[not translated]

Ye. Arefyeva. International Division of Labor: The Place and
Role of the Liberated Countries [not translated]..... 4

A. Vorontsov. The Far East. The Tension Factor 8

V. Yakovlev. The United States, Japan and SDI 12

TOWARD THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREAT OCTOBER

O. Gromova, O. Mushtuk. Africa. The Active Power of Social
Transformations [not translated]..... 16

ON THE PAGES OF SOCIALISM

N. Vasilyev. Laos. Striving toward the Future [not translated].. 19

ON THE PATH OF PROGRESSIVE TRANSFORMATIONS

Yu. Savitskiy [deceased]. Ghana. Surmounting Difficulties 23
[not translated]

PROBLEMS AND DISCUSSION

G. Mirskiy. The Liberated States: Paths of Development 26

MARCH 8TH--INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

V. Rozhkov. Mongolia. The Happiness of Mothers in the
Happiness of their Children [not translated]..... 30

Ye. Pozdorovkina. The Persian Gulf. Women in the Changing Arab
World [not translated]..... 31

Nigeria. The Cult of Women [not translated].....	35
THE ECONOMIST'S PLATFORM	
V. Shitov. New Forms of MNC Expansion	36
TRAVELS, MEETINGS, IMPRESSIONS	
A. Dikarev, A. Lukin. China. On the Island of Taiwan [not translated]	38
Nikolay Baratov. Burkina Faso. Bukary and Others [not translated]	42
EVENTS... FACTS... FIGURES... [not translated].....	46
CULTURE, LITERATURE, ART	
I. Vlasova. The Treasures of Afghanistan [not translated].....	50
Yu. Prolomov. Nigeria. Masterpieces of the Beninese Masters [not translated]	51
S. Stoklitskiy. Lebanon. Singer of the Squares [not translated].	53
TRADITIONS, CUSTOMS, MORES	
B. Zagumennov. India. Older than the Teachings of the Yogi [not translated]	54
NUMISMATICS	
Ye. Davidovich. Two Equations with Two Unknowns. Conclusion [not translated]	58
THE WORLD OF BOOKS	
A. Kovalevskiy. A Crisis of Economic Relations	62
Ye. Rashkovskiy. The World of Jawaharlal Nehru [not translated]..	62
V. Isayev. Comprehensive Research	63
N. Yonkov. Social Movements and Religion in the Arab World	64
COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"	

12821

CSO: 1807/276

REVIEW OF THE JOURNAL AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA NO 3, 1987

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 2 Apr 87 pp 1-4

[Text] "For a Nuclear-Weapon Free and Non-Violent World" -- under this title the journal has published a report on the Round Table meeting organized by the Academic Council of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences jointly with the Academic Council of the Far East Institute of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Diplomatic Academy and the AZIA O AFRIKA SEGODNYA and NARODY AZII I AFRIKI periodicals participated in it. The meeting discussed the historic importance of the Delhi Declaration.

"International Division of Labour: the Place and Role of Newly-Free Countries" is the subject of an article by Y. Arefyeva. She writes that the change of the place of developing countries in the world industrial structure sets them a double task -- to change the internal structure of production and to increase the proportion of industrial products in exports. Both of these directions are subject to great influence from outside, first of all, by the world capitalist economy.

The settlement of the internal contradictions in the centers of world capitalism is accompanied with the aggravation of problems in developing countries. The emergent states pay, in effect, for the technological upgrading of other's production by their own lag in industrial development and by their persisting financial dependence on foreign countries. As before, the capitalist centers seek to form structures, which only supplement their own, on the periphery.

In search of a way out of the crisis of the participation in the internal division of labour, developing countries expand their mutual exchanges, as well as economic relations with socialist countries. According to the calculations by experts of the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), there exists already a basis for such an increase in the volume of trade in industrial products among developing countries which would allow them to raise their share in the world manufacturing-industry output from 10.4 per cent in 1983 to 17 per cent in 1990.

One cannot but agree with the conclusions by the UNIDO experts that acceleration of industrial development in newly-free countries and resolution

of quite a number of foreign economic problems, first of all the debt issue, is possible only if corresponding structural changes take place in the world capitalist economic centers, the author writes. For this reason, the efforts of developing countries are aimed at making the developed capitalist countries comprehend this aspect of mutual dependence.

In the current situation, the joint struggle of developing countries against neocolonialist expansion acquires particular importance, the article says. The friendly support of the peoples of socialist countries is on their side.

"The USA, Japan and SDI" is the title of an article by V. Yakovlev. He writes that the incumbent US administration is patently out to make SDI irreversible through getting other developed capitalist countries, including Japan, involved in the SDI programme. Relying on the selfish interests of the Japanese bourgeois Party-and-government elite, the Reagan Administration is expediting the political elaboration, juridical finalization, and functioning of the US-Japan mechanism of implementing the programme.

Accumulating the latest scientific and technological achievements of other states, US military-industrial circles intend to speed up the United States' technological development, particularly in the military-technical sphere, thereby attaining world supremacy. Simultaneously, by intensifying efforts in the military-technical and military-industrial spheres, they induce the development of the national military-industrial complexes and their integration into a transnational complex under US aegis, which creates a socio-economic base for militarising the economy at world level and raises obstacles to ending the arms race and achieving disarmament. On the whole, however, implementation of the SDI programme aggravates the entire set of contradictions in the world and creates an unpredictable situation.

One can hardly hope, the author of the article opines, that the US military-industrial complex would give up the advantages which SDI makes available to it and that, after it accumulates the scientific and technological achievements of other countries, it will pass on benefits to Japan or anyone else. Transferring through SDI its latest technologies to the Americans, Japan may consolidate its own dependent status in relations with the USA, being unable to do anything about it any longer.

In their article "The Driving Force of Social Transformations" O. Gromova and O. Mushtuk write that the post-colonial development of African labour unions largely depends on what way of development their respective countries have chosen and what employment and labour policies their governments pursue in line with their choice.

The countries of the socialist orientation and their revolutionary democratic governments, above all, those relying on the Marxist-Leninist theory in their daily work, more often than not encourage the proletariat and its unions to be involved in the overall drive to cope with the issues of non-capitalist development and safeguard their revolutionary gains from encroachments by the domestic and foreign reactionaries. This policy offers formidable leverage to enhance the role and social meaning of labour unions in accomplishing progressive transformations and anti-capitalist orientation.

In the countries developing along the capitalist lines labour unions are opposed by pro-bourgeois regimes which together with Western neocolonialist and right-wing opportunistic forces seek to gear the African labour and its unions to the goals of national reformatory ideology and policy in an attempt to develop apolitical syndicalism obedient to the authorities. But in spite of attempts to curb unions with all kinds of restraints and petty tutelage, even under such unfavorable conditions organized labour in African countries not only protects the material interests of the working people but opposes the offensive by foreign capital and promotes the democratizing of social and political affairs at home.

African labour unions are seen as centers rallying proletariat's transition from the struggle for its economic rights and interests to political action against neocolonialism, domestic reaction and world imperialism.

The magazine also carries an article by A. Vorontsov, "The Far East. Tensions Factor," about the emerging military axis Washington--Tokyo--Seoul; "Laos. Looking into the Future" by N. Vassiliev; "Ghana Copes with Its Problems" by Y. Savitsky; a major article by G. Mirskoy, "Emergent Nations: Ways of Development," etc.

12821

CSO: 1812/169

U.S.-JAPAN-S. KOREA ALLIANCE SOURCE OF 'TENSION' IN FAR EAST

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 pp 8-11

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences A. Vorontsov under the rubric "The Far East": "The Tension Factor"]

[Text] In the program speech in Vladivostok of 28 Jul 86, in which a new and comprehensive approach of the Soviet Union in relation to the Asian Pacific region was formulated, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev indicated in particular the fact that under the pressure of the United States, there currently "is taking shape a militarized 'triad' of Washington--Tokyo--Seoul." The processes that are transpiring within its framework, especially in recent years, give sufficient grounds for such an evaluation, although (and this is in and of itself extremely noteworthy) bourgeois political figures and political organizers are trying doggedly to deny the existence or possibility of the appearance of a three-way military and political grouping among these countries.

As is well known, Tokyo and Seoul are faithful allies of Washington. The Japanese-American alliance, which is considered in the United States as "the chief achievement of American foreign policy in Asia after the Second World War," is based on the "Security Pact" signed in San Francisco in 1951 and its later revision in the 1960 "Treaty on Mutual Collaboration and Security Guarantee." In accordance with these agreements, the United States maintains 46,000 military personnel on the Japanese islands and has 118 military facilities at its disposal.

The "Mutual Defense Treaty between the Republic of Korea and the United States," concluded in 1953, is the foundation of the alliance between Washington and Seoul. Based on it, over 40,000 American servicemen are stationed in the southern Korean peninsula.

After the conclusion of bilateral agreements with the two Far Eastern allies, the problem of "laying bridges" between Japan and South Korea occupied an important place in the hierarchy of the foreign-policy tasks of the White House. This made it possible to attract Tokyo into the American efforts to reinforce the Seoul regime, as well as being an essential precondition for beginning the process of forming a trilateral military and political grouping in the future.

As a result of the efforts of Washington, as well as the inherent vested interest of the ruling circles of Tokyo and Seoul, the "Treaty on the Foundations of Relations between Japan and South Korea" was concluded in 1965, which laid the basis for the normalization and active development of relations between Tokyo and Seoul. As early as during that period, the Japanese press noted that the foundation for the genesis of Japanese-Korean relations was wholly the definite aspirations of the United States. "Washington has long cherished hopes of uniting economically powerful Japan and militarily strong South Korea, so as to create in that manner a base for the preservation of a stable situation and the restraint of the communist advance in the Far East," wrote the Japanese newspaper ASAHI SHIMBUN.

After the normalization of Japanese-South Korean relations, a "division of labor" quickly appeared between Washington and Tokyo with regard to the Seoul regime: the United States provided first and foremost its military support and political stability, and Japan supplied the economic stability. Thus, as early as the beginning stage of development of Japanese-South Korean relations, a unity of opinion of the leadership of Japan and the United States relative to the role of Seoul in their strategies was defined.

This role was fixed in the joint Sato-Nixon communique in 1969 within the framework of the "Nixon Doctrine," which recognized that the security of South Korea "was inseparable from the very security of Japan." Thus was taken the first step toward laying the legal foundation for increasing the military potential of Seoul through the combined efforts of the United States and Japan. It was no accident that South Korean dictator Park Chung Hee declared in July of 1970 that after these negotiations, the possibility of creating a "trilateral defense structure" had appeared.

The policy of deepening the involvement of the Far Eastern allies in the American strategy was consolidated and continued in the "Pacific Doctrine" of Ford. As a result of the American-Japanese negotiations between G. Ford and T. Miki in August of 1975, a comprehensive "security concept" for Eastern Asia was worked out that envisaged a considerable increase in the responsibility of Japan with regard to the pro-Western countries of the region, and first and foremost South Korea.

Possibilities for arranging direct ties between Tokyo and Seoul in the military and political realm also appeared under similar circumstances. Notable milestones in this process were the creation of a Japanese-South Korean parliamentary council on issues of security in April of 1979 and the first visit of the chief of the Japanese National Defense Administration (NDA) G. Yamasita to Seoul which took place in June of 1979, the first in the history of bilateral relations.

Typical is the evaluation of this visit given by the French LE MONDE, which emphasized that although the Japanese military powers denied the existence of plans to create an integrated defense system between the United States, Japan and South Korea, "such an evolution looks no less logical and predictable from this." Under conditions of the integration of the military staffs of the Pentagon and the NDA on the basis of the "Basic Principles for Collaboration

between the United States and Japan on Defense Issues" that were adopted in 1978, on the one hand, and the military departments of the United States and South Korea within the framework of the joint armed forces command of the two countries that was created on the southern Korean peninsula in that same year, on the other, the visit of G. Yamasita to Seoul was assessed as an attempt to develop horizontal ties between the two "protoges" of the Americans.

In this manner, as early as at this time Washington, based on the solid foundation created in the preceding years of developed bilateral relations with Tokyo and Seoul, applied its efforts to combining its Far Eastern allies into a trilateral structure.

A new stage in the development of relations within the framework of the "triad" under consideration ensued with the arrival of R. Reagan in the White House in 1981, representing the interests of the most aggressive reactionary forces of the United States, and the appearance somewhat later, in 1983, of the conservative government of Y. Nakasone in Japan. The dictator in South Korea was replaced. The new one was Chun Doo Hwan.

The Far Eastern region occupied a special place in the plans of the Reagan administration, which brought to the forefront confrontation with the world of socialism. The former commander of the U.S. armed forces in the Pacific, R. Long, stated in an interview with the newspaper ASAHI: "The Pacific region, in my opinion, is the most important region for the United States in the 1980s and the subsequent period... It is precisely in that region, probably, I assume, that we will witness a confrontation with the Soviet Union."

R. Reagan has decisively altered the "Korean policy" of the previous administration, not only completely renouncing the plans to withdraw part of the U.S. land forces from South Korea, but even posing the question of increasing the American military presence there. According to a report of the South Korean news agency Ronhap of 23 Nov 82, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State L. Eagleberger asserted that "everything we have done over this year and a half should be considered by the South Korean powers as evidence of our determination not only to remain there, but to improve our position."

In accordance with such instructions, the Pentagon deployed an additional squadron of A-10 attack aircraft on the Korean peninsula and increased the number of American servicemen by a thousand men.

The determination of Washington to increase the might of American armed forces in South Korea was demonstrated anew during the visit of R. Reagan to Seoul of 12-14 Nov 83. It was emphasized in a joint communique that "the United States will continue to maintain the fighting ability of its troops in South Korea, strengthen its capabilities and offer the necessary systems of arms and technology to strengthen the might of the armed forces of Korea."

The demonstrative trip of R. Reagan to the area of the demilitarized zone on the Korean peninsula on 13 Nov, where he inspected the American troops stationed there, was undertaken with the same goals. As the Japanese DAILY YOMIURI noted, "Reagan became the first American president to visit the demilitarized zone."

Perhaps more dangerous than the numerical growth in the armed forces of the United States in the Far East, however, is the realization of a new direction for the strategy of the Pentagon--the saturation of the region with nuclear weapons and modern delivery systems, including the deployment of medium-range systems. Not satisfied with the presence of about a thousand tactical nuclear warheads in South Korea, the Pentagon is currently developing plans to deploy neutron weapons here. U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger noted in this regard that "they will be needed on the battlefield. And the battlefield could be, for example, Korea."

The Pentagon, adding to the already existing stockpiles of American nuclear weapons in South Korea, has stationed modern delivery systems here and in Japan. The F-4 fighter-bombers on the Korean peninsula were replaced with ultramodern F-16s. An agreement was simultaneously concluded on the sale of 36 such aircraft to the Seoul regime, which are capable of reaching not only the territory of North Korea, but the USSR and China as well. Over this same period, 50 F-16 aircraft were deployed at the American Mishawa base in Japan. Furthermore, in November of last year the United States decided to deploy their tactical-operational Lance missiles in South Korea. New nuclear-missile parameters were thus in essence introduced into the military situation in the Far East. As M.S. Gorbachev emphasized when speaking in Vladivostok, "although two of the three states in the region with nuclear weapons--China and the USSR--have given assurances not to employ them first, the United States has deployed nuclear-weapons carriers and nuclear warheads in one of the crisis zones--the Korean peninsula--and, furthermore, nuclear-weapons carriers on the territory of Japan."

Japan and South Korea have in this manner come to be integrated into the nuclear strategy of the Pentagon and involved in the global confrontation of the United States with the Soviet Union. The participation of Japan in SDI and the decision to eliminate the ten-year-old limitations on the growth in military spending to one percent of the gross national product should be considered new evidence of the further involvement of Tokyo in the strategic military designs of Washington.

These processes have given new impetus to the development of the trilateral ties among the United States, Japan and South Korea. The missing link for the formation of a trilateral alliance is the absence of a military treaty between Tokyo and Seoul. And although this document will hardly appear in the near future in view of the presence of a whole set of serious contradictions between them, the specific features of the internal political situation and the mood of public opinion in Japan and South Korea, bilateral ties in the military and political sphere are also developing and this process has accelerated in recent years under the pressure of the Reagan administration.

The fact that the Seoul dictator was the first high-level guest received by Reagan as president, while Y. Nakasone, having become prime minister of Japan, against tradition made his first visit to South Korea, and only then went to the United States, speaks eloquently of the increased attention of the ruling circles of the United States and Japan toward the regime of Chun Doo Hwan. Political observers have fairly pointed out, however, the inseparable

interconnection of the contacts of the leaders of the three countries, having emphasized that "the trip of Y. Nakasone to Seoul was the first leg of his trip to Washington."

It must be said that Y. Nakasone, in coming to power, decisively revised the attitude of his predecessor D. Suzuki toward the Seoul regime. In the course of the aforementioned visit to Seoul, he quickly brought the prolonged and difficult bilateral negotiations to a conclusion, agreeing to grant South Korea a very large loan of four billion dollars and ending an almost two-year period of tension overall in Japanese-South Korean relations. NDA Academy Professor M. Mishihara justly noted in this regard: "Japanese aid to South Korea is an outstanding example of strategic assistance, although the government never announced that our assistance was for purposes of security."

After these and subsequent visits of the leaders of the three countries, the Western press began speaking of a new stage, a "new partnership" in Japanese-South Korean and American-South Korean relations. There really are grounds for these assertions. No one would argue with the fact that the scope and depth of collaboration in the realm of trade and economics among these countries has led to the appearance of a state of "asymmetrical mutual dependence." This process is gradually being extended to the military and political spheres as well.

After the aforementioned visit of Japanese NDA Chief G. Yamasita to Seoul, contacts between the military departments of the two countries have become regular. In 1981, agreement was reached on the "friendly visit" of a naval detachment of South Korea to Japan. At the same time, a group of officers of the Seoul regime was accepted to the Japanese military academy. According to reports of NIHON KEIDZAI, the NDA has lately sent representatives of the air force, navy and army to Seoul annually for the purpose of "familiarization with research in the realm of defense," testing the ground for the achievement of an agreement for possible joint maneuvers on South Korean territory. In 1983, it sent to Seoul for the first time a large group of students of the military academy, who attended naval and air-force schools. Highly placed military representatives of Japan in recent years have attended the large annual American-South Korean "Team Spirit" military maneuvers. Noting this fact, the newspaper AKAHATA wrote: "The interaction of the United States, Japan and South Korea in the event of the breakout of a second Korean War is worked out in practice in the course of these exercises."

The Pentagon, along with "Team Spirit," is conducting large American-Japanese military maneuvers like those that were conducted last year for purposes of the interaction of the armies of the three countries. Plans for a blockade of the three straits between the Japanese islands in the event of conflict for the purpose of "locking in" the Soviet Navy in the Sea of Japan are also being discussed. The TOKYO SIMBUN emphasized in this regard that "insofar as the western passage of the Korean Strait adjoins the territorial waters of South Korea... the plan to blockade the Korean Strait can be considered a concrete incarnation of the concept of alliance between Tokyo and Seoul."

The facts thus testify that notwithstanding all of the attempts to camouflage the process of forming a trilateral military and political grouping of

Washington--Tokyo--Seoul, its aggressive essence and the formation of this structure are a reality that poses a serious threat to peace and security not only on the Korean peninsula, but in all of the Far East. At the same time, it is essential to note that the process of deepening trilateral ties within the framework of the structure under consideration are being developed in parallel with the process of gradual increase in the independence of the Far Eastern allies of Washington, an increase in the "Japanese element" in the American-Japanese alliance and growth in confidence in its forces by South Korea.

Such an evolution of allied relations is based first and foremost on dynamic growth in the economies of both countries, and first of all, of course, Japan, which has been transformed into an economic giant and the second power of the capitalist world. This relates to a certain extent to South Korea as well, which as a member of the group of "new industrial countries" is demonstrating steady economic growth rates over an extremely prolonged period.

A new model for allied relations characterized by the development of informal coalitional ties, within the framework of which Washington is striving to make maximum use of the increased potential of the allies in its strategy, taking into account therein the specific features of the mutual relations between Tokyo and Seoul and their autonomous foreign-policy interests, is currently being realized in the "triad" under consideration. Such a situation evidently suits both Washington and its Far Eastern allies. By virtue of this circumstance, it is hardly possible to expect a conclusive formalization and legal formulation of allied relations among Washington, Tokyo and Seoul in the foreseeable future, and these relations will develop in the form of unofficial coalitional ties.

It is unnecessary to say that such a version of allied ties within the framework of this triple grouping does not seriously change the substance, purpose or functions of the "triad." This "triad" aims its spearhead against the socialist countries of Asia and is the chief obstacle on the path of settlement of the situation on the Korean peninsula and the peaceful and independent unification of Korea.

The sole realistic and just alternative is the policy being proposed by the socialist countries, and first of all the USSR, North Korea and Mongolia. This policy, as emphasized by M.S. Gorbachev when speaking in Vladivostok, is directed toward "including the Asian Pacific region in the overall process of creating an all-encompassing system of international security."

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821
CSO: 1807/276

U.S.-JAPAN COOPERATION IN MILITARY TECHNOLOGY, SDI ASSAILED

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 pp 12-15

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Yakovlev: "The United States, Japan and SDI"]

[Text] On 9 Sep 86, Japanese Chief Cabinet Secretary M. Gotoda made an announcement of Japanese participation in the American program to create an all-encompassing system of anti-missile defense (ABM) officially titled the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). Japan became the fourth country--after Great Britain, West Germany and Israel--to take on obligations in the development of weapons, including space weapons, based on the latest scientific and technical achievements and the newest principles of physics. Italy was declared the fifth to be included in SDI. The unification of efforts in SDI testifies to the aspirations of the United States to shift its relations with the other capitalist states to a new qualitative level that would permit the Americans to preserve and strengthen its position in the world of capital and would ensure the winning of technical and strategic military superiority over the socialist community, and first and foremost over the USSR.

The definition of a subordinate role for Japan in the global designs of the United States is confirmed by the whole course of Japanese-American relations in the postwar period, especially in the military economic and technical spheres. Soon after the end of the Second World War, the United States set about the restoration of the Japanese military industry, and during the period of military aggression against Korea made active use of Japan's productive capacity for the material and technical support of its troops, especially in munitions, and repair and restoration work on combat equipment.

The legal formulation of Japanese-American military and technical collaboration was obtained in the form of the "Agreement on Mutual Aid in Defense" signed in 1954. Article IV of this document speaks of the fact that the governments of both states are obligated to take steps to create optimal conditions for the exchange of technical information and the transfer of rights of industrial ownership for defensive purposes. The Japanese-American intergovernmental "Agreement on Simplifying the Procedure for the Exchange of Patents and Technological Knowledge for Defensive Purposes" was signed in Tokyo in March of 1956 to develop this article. Article V of this document

envisaged, in particular, the possibility of the uncompensated transfer of patents, know-how and technical documentation to Japan that was the property of the government of the United States.

On the basis of this agreement, the American Defense Department transferred, for example, patents and technical documentation for the production of the Hawk and Nike guided anti-aircraft missiles to the Japanese National Defense Administration (NDA). With the conclusion of this agreement Japan, on the one hand, opened up access to American military technology that was becoming obsolete, which stimulated the arrangement of the production of complex prototypes of weapons in the country, and on the other hand tied Japan to American military technology and drew it into the military preparations of the United States, deepening its subordinate position and dependence.

In February of 1962, a new intergovernmental agreement was concluded-- "Agreement on the Exchange of Data." In accordance with it, the Americans began to transfer to Japan scientific and technical information and other data on a broad circle of military technology, including electronics, air-to-air missiles, and naval and ground-forces weapons. The Japanese government was obligated to ensure secrecy in the process of using the military and technical information obtained from the United States. The agreement envisaged the execution of regular conferences of the representatives of the military departments and technical specialists of both countries to adopt specific resolutions on the exchange of technical military knowledge. The question was consequently placed on the agenda of the transfer of technology not only from the United States to Japan, but in the opposite direction as well.

Over the course of the 1960s and 1970s, the economic, scientific and technical development of Japan reached such a level that it had moved into second behind the United States in the capitalist world. Its gross national product in 1979 for the first time crossed the trillion-dollar line. And whereas the share of the United States in the aggregate gross national product of the developed capitalist world in the 1951-1985 period declined steadily (from 44.5 to 40.2 percent), the share of Japan grew (from 7.6 to 14.8 percent respectively). In trade with the Americans, Japan systematically began to have a positive net balance of trade. In 1980 it totaled seven billion dollars, in 1981 13.3 billion, in 1982 12.2, in 1983 20.4, in 1984 34 and in 1985 39.5 billion dollars. Less than half of the United States level of proportionate share of world capitalist exports 15 years earlier, Japan today is comparable with it, and in the share of export of industrial items, has considerably surpassed it. In the military-industrial and military-technical regards, Japan has achieved the ability to manufacture all types of modern arms, and does not produce certain types of them, principally heavy weapons, only for political or economic considerations. All of this has led to the aspirations of the United States to alter qualitatively Japanese-American technical military collaboration: they have now begun to display increased interest in Japanese achievements in equipment and technology.

Since May of 1980, the U.S. Defense Department has become more active in preparing and conducting regular bilateral conferences within the framework of the "Agreement on the Exchange of Data." The first of these was held in September, the second in November of 1980 and the third in December of 1981.

In the course of these conferences, agreement was reached on the closer coordination of their efforts in the realm of military scientific research and planning and design work and the exchange of military technology, along with expansion of U.S. access to the latest Japanese technology in microelectronics and dual-application technologies and the beginning of joint research and development of the basic problems and systems components of anti-aircraft defense--radar and guided anti-aircraft missiles.

At the same time, cooperation in the production of military items at the firm level was raised to a qualitatively new level. The Japanese company Fuji Jukogyo, along with the American firm of Bell, set about the development of the new Bell AH-1S helicopter, the Hughes Aircraft Company (United States) proposed to the Toshiba Company the beginning of joint development on the next generation of anti-aircraft missiles, and the firm of Rockwell International proposed the start-up of development of new prototypes of military electronics apparatus with four Japanese electrical-equipment companies--Hitachi, Mitsubishi Denki, Toshiba and Nippon Denki.

In the course of realization of the intergovernmental agreements and contracts on a commercial basis among the industrial enterprises of both countries, the Americans, on the one hand, obtained access to certain types of the latest Japanese military and dual-application technologies, and on the other, worked out a mechanism for the exchange of technical military knowledge. The United States became more active in the creation of a structure of bilateral technical military contacts which would permit their Defense Department to make effective use on a stable basis of the scientific and technical achievements of Japan for military purposes. Much attention was devoted to this at the negotiations of the NDA chief with the U.S. Secretary of Defense in October of 1982 and during the Washington meeting of Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone with President Reagan in January of 1983.

In November of 1983, on the eve of the visit of Reagan to Japan, a protocol was signed between the Japanese minister of foreign affairs and the American ambassador which envisaged in particular the creation of an intergovernmental joint commission on military technology. Its first session took place in November of 1984. In August of that same year, at the sixth consultation on technical military issues, out of 16 of the latest types of technology that the Pentagon was interested in, five were singled out as being especially important: the production of gallium arsenide, new composite materials, industrial ceramics, heat-resistant materials and developments in optical electronics.

The United States intends to use these and other types of the latest technologies for prospective prototypes of weapons. Materials developed by the Tokyo Denki Kagaku Kogyo and Nippon Denki companies that absorb electromagnetic waves have already been employed in the creation of the "invisible" Stealth bomber. Japanese microelectronics are used in the production of cruise missiles, as is fiber-optic cable in communications systems.

By the middle of 1985, the list of military technology and the latest dual-application technology being requested by the United States had grown to 38

types of items, including 11 of the greatest interest to the Pentagon. Among them were electro-optic components for missile navigation and control systems, semiconductor lasers, fiber-optic materials and gyroscopes.

In adding increases to the influx of the latest Japanese technology to the United States, the American administration does not conceal its intention of using it to further SDI. The U.S. Secretary of Defense expressed this most candidly in a letter to the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs in March of 1985. This "candidness" in political considerations to a certain extent restrained the Japanese leadership from official declaration of inclusion in the American military space program. Giving the appearance that the attitude toward SDI had supposedly not yet been determined, they actively sought to bring it to life. Representative delegations of a number of ministries and departments, as well as business circles, were sent to the United States, and their mission included defining the spheres of the latest technology where Japan could make its contribution to the realization of SDI. Japanese business circles both at home and abroad were subjected to strong treatment for the purpose of inclining them sooner toward broad participation in this program. Thus, in December of 1985 an agreement was signed in Tokyo and immediately went into effect on Japan's offering of the latest military technology to the United States. It touched on such spheres as laser and optical devices, apparatus for operating at high frequencies, light guides, liquid-crystal displays and other scientific and technical innovations that considerably enhance, in the opinion of American specialists, the effectiveness of modern weapons.

A third and most imposing delegation visited the United States in March-April of 1986 which included 55 people, of which 46 were delegated by the leading concerns of Japan, including Fujitsu, Hitachi, Kawasaki Jukogyo, Toshiba, Sony, Kobe Seikosyo, Nissan Jidosya and Mitsubishi Denki. Upon returning from across the ocean, the members of the delegation were at once received by the government and recommended that it accept participation in research on the American SDI program, which was done.

With the inclusion of the other developed capitalist states, including Japan, in SDI, the current American administration is striving to impart an irreversible nature to it. Based on the coincident egotistical interests of the Japanese bourgeois government and party elite, the Reagan administration is accelerating the political development, legal consolidation and practical activity of the Japanese-American mechanism for the realization of this program. Its components include both the technical military collaboration conducted earlier in the form of the intergovernmental agreements and new forms--in the form of interdepartmental protocols, commercial contracts, regular conferences, the negotiations of highly placed individuals, and the exchange of delegations of representatives of a number of ministries, departments and business circles. With the launch of this mechanism into action, the American military-industrial hierarchy is trying to solidify its positions in the domestic economic and foreign-policy life of the United States.

Accumulating the latest scientific and technical achievements of other states, American military-industrial circles are thinking of accelerating the process

of technological development of the United States, including in the technical military realm, and in that manner asserting their world dominion. Incidentally, in increasing their technical military and military-industrial activity through SDI, they are stimulating the development of national military-industrial complexes and their integration into the multinational complex under the aegis of the United States, which is creating a socio-economic base for the militarization of the economy on a world level and is placing obstacles in the path of halting the arms race and of disarmament. Overall, the realization of SDI is worsening a whole set of contradictions existing in the world and is creating a situation of unpredictability in the development of events.

In participating in SDI, Japan evidently is counting on joining in the advertised technical and technological innovations that are supposedly anticipated in the course of its realization. It has not been ruled out that the business circles want to work on foreign contracts, as well as not to permit a significant technological break with the United States from the Japanese scientific and technical level, in that manner not permitting a change in the fundamentally favorable economic and trade relations of Japan with the Americans. Furthermore, counting on its efficiency in the mass circulation of scientific and technical achievements through new products, the Japanese businessmen are hoping to monopolize new areas in the world market for scientifically sophisticated and high-technology industrial products, which will permit Japan to solidify its position as a world economic power.

Even the short-term practice of British-American and West German-American collaboration on SDI, however, shows that for Great Britain and West Germany, the specific results of this program are irreconcilably far from the illusory advantages advertised by the United States before they joined it: England envisages orders of 1.5 instead of 10 billion dollars, and West Germany has established a whole series of limitations of the use of the results of research by West German firms. Upset by this turn of events, Japanese business circles have begun to display alarm that they will fall into the same situation. On the eve of the trip of the Japanese delegation to the United States (end of October and beginning of November 1986) to discuss the terms of Japanese participation in SDI, therefore, the Defense Industry Committee of the Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren) prepared a special letter in which was contained an appeal to the government not to permit discrimination against Japanese firms compared to American ones.

There were sufficient grounds for the Japanese businessmen to fear such discrimination. The obligation of the Japanese government to ensure secrecy in the process of using technical military information obtained from the United States ("Agreement on the Exchange of Data") could not help but limit, first, the flow of this technology, second, the directions and scale of the use of this information and, third, could not help but further the arbitrary adoption of American solutions on a whole set of issues connected with SDI, thus strengthening the subordinate role of Japan in relation to the United States.

It is difficult to hope that the American military-industrial complex, sacrificing the welfare and security of its own people, will reject the

advantages that SDI gives it and, having accumulated the scientific and technical achievements of other countries, transfer the benefits from this to Japan or someone else. The prospect seems more realistic that the United States will pay for the Japanese technology basically with income from these very Japanese firms through the establishment of export quotas for their products to the American market (the refusal of the Japanese firm of Nissan to work on SDI can serve as an example of this). Furthermore, through intergovernmental agreements the Americans, it seems, are trying to surmount the barriers of mistrust among the Japanese firms, that is, to legalize their own type of "industrial espionage" and make use of its greater information to raise the marketability of its products and reduce that of Japanese ones. Transferring its latest technology to the Americans through SDI, Japan can come to be in a situation where its own efforts strengthen its subordinate position in relations with the United States, but it will be unable to change anything.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821
CSO: 1807/276

PROBLEMS OF CAPITALIST PATH OF DEVELOPMENT ANALYZED

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 pp 26-29

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences G. Mirskiy under the rubric "Problems and Opinions": "The Liberated States: Paths of Development"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] Many scholars from the most varied of countries devote their works to the historical fates of the Third World. The problems of development paths and the social orientation of the states of Asia and Africa are at the center of attention of our academic community as well. In recent years, Soviet Oriental scholars have published a number of works in which are contained a contemporary analysis of the specific features of Asian and African society that impart the specific traits to both the capitalist and the socialist orientation of the developing states. The editors of our journal are beginning the publication of articles devoted to the specific features of these "routes" of the liberated countries and the combination in them of general laws of social development already well known and specific "Oriental" traits.

We invite Oriental scholars to take part in the academic discussion on the circle of problems outlined.

Is capitalism spreading in the Third World? It is hardly possible to give anything but an affirmative answer to this question today: the overwhelming majority of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are proceeding along the path of capitalist development. How effective and stable this path is turning out to be is another matter. But what kind of capitalism it is and to what extent the given term is applicable in general to what is transpiring in the developing countries, and especially in the African and Asian ones--there are different points of view on this account.

Until recently, the opinion was quite widespread, if not predominant, that the Orient "was late in getting onto the capitalist train," that history has not yet answered for this time and the capitalist structure cannot be "system-forming" in Asia and Africa. Many authors consider "Oriental capitalism" a surrogate or even a caricature of capitalism, calling it "rickety," a "mongrel" etc. Even Western scholars that are far from being of an

antibourgeois inclination often write of it with a hint of regret or dissatisfaction.

In fact, the weakness of the bourgeoisie in the Orient is not only financial, but one could say "spiritual" as well, its lack of independence, shortage of dynamism and boldness, inclination toward business activity in the non-productive sphere, bent toward state protectionism and, finally, its activity under the conditions of Oriental society with its known specific nature, traditions and religion, not favoring the development of incentives for individual achievements or for private enterprise on a major scale, especially in the sphere of industry--all of these subjective factors tend toward a skeptical evaluation of the prospects for the establishment of a powerful class of capitalists in Asia and Africa. And if such an important objective factor as scientific and technical revolution, requiring enormous capital investment to create modern industrial enterprises that correspond to the highest world standards, is added to this, and if one takes into account that this modern industry is not labor-intensive enough, the resolution of the problem of employment for an enormous body of the population cannot seriously be facilitated, they are unable to get work in the modern sector and are doomed to vegetate in the "traditional" sector, too little included in the sphere of the capitalist economy, it becomes clear that this sphere will remain narrow, an "enclave," in the economy of the developing countries.

All of these notions, reinforced by such an affirmative fact as the historically almost unprecedented growth in the state sector of the economy, including in the countries of capitalist development, has led to conclusions of the low potential of capitalism in the Afro-Asian states. The transition of these states onto the non-capitalist path--an inevitable transition dictated by the very logic of life itself--was correspondingly outlined for the very near future.

But years passed, and reality did not confirm these predictions. Looking at things soberly, it should be acknowledged that the movement for a departure from capitalism toward non-capitalist development is weaker today than it was a quarter century ago. In some countries that have proclaimed an orientation toward socialism, a recoil or degeneration has occurred, while in several others the latent growth of capitalist industrial relations in the city and the village is noticeable. And furthermore: the fact that we (including the author of this article) had earlier been too optimistic, things look somewhat different in speaking, say, of Egypt under Nasser. Serious transformations were made there, but their depth was exaggerated. Only later did much become clear. Thus, nine years after the death of the Egyptian president, PRAVDA published an article in which it was asserted, in particular, that the social polarization of the Egyptian village was just "somewhat smoothed over by the agrarian reforms of the Nasser period, which had put an end to large landowners and feudal lords. The rich peasants and middle-class landowners and entrepreneurs, who became the chief economic, social and political force beyond the bounds of the cities, grew and were reinforced in the village... The cooperative boards created under Nasser should have consisted of some 80 percent poor peasants, but even then educational qualifications... in practice handed them over to the hands of the well-to-do peasants..."¹ It is apparent today that the seeds of the poisonous flowers that blossomed under Sadat had

been planted in Egyptian soil in the time of Nasser, although not by him himself. The "new bourgeoisie" also appeared under Nasser, and he spoke of it himself more than once, and Sadat just gave this class the "green light." That is when the bureaucratic bourgeoisie began to flourish.

This naturally does not signify that the transition from "Nasserism" to "Sadatism" was fatalistically predetermined. It all could have gone differently if Nasser had been fated to live longer, if he had wanted (and been able) to proceed to the "second revolution" against the new privileged segments, in which he rightly saw the chief threat to his cause. But this should have been a "new revolution": after all, capitalism had grown and penetrated everywhere.²

Of course, no one was asserting that the non-capitalist path (as any path to socialism) was the total rejection or "prohibition" of the private sector. Recall what Lenin wrote on this score, indicating the development of trade and capitalism as a phenomenon "inevitable with the existence of millions of small producers."³ But state capitalism with dictatorship of the proletariat is one thing, and its absence, where a petty-bourgeois revolutionary democracy at best, or frequently a state bureaucracy, is in power is quite another. Without dictatorship of the proletariat or national-democratic power that is close to it in essence, there is always the danger of both the upper and lower reaches of society becoming bourgeois.

State capitalism now extends to the Asian and African countries with the most varied of social superstructures--from leftist ones proclaiming socialist orientation⁴ to right-wing ones that are openly reactionary and pro-bourgeois. The very term "state capitalism" suffers from a wholly understandable ambiguity: after all, it signified another quite different phenomenon when it was associated with the policies of proletarian power that temporarily permitted the development of capitalist relations under NEP. But if we agree that we do not have in mind this phenomenon, but rather a system based on a "mixed economy" in the developing countries, the applicability of this concept can hardly evoke doubts.

The widespread development of the state sector--for reasons mentioned above and associated with the inability of the private sector to take upon itself the enormous task of restructuring the colonial structure and the economy--is typical for practically all of the Third World countries. There was even a powerful state sector in Iran under the Shah's regime, which was reactionary and pro-capitalist. (By the way, even in the developed capitalist countries the state sector occupies a position today that is incomparably greater than before.) At the same time, a quite broad development of the private sector (especially in agriculture, trade, construction and the service sphere, as well as in small industry) is also observed in the socialist-oriented countries. Typical of regimes with even the most varied and even contradictory socio-political orientations are efforts to "take the best" from both world systems and combine it in some sort of symbiosis of the achievements of capitalism and socialism.

It is namely the trend toward the state along with the already mentioned weakness, lack of independence and specific look of the "Oriental bourgeoisie"

that has engendered doubts among many scholars: is this capitalism at all? The unconventional and "unorthodox" nature of the version of capitalism observed in Asia and Africa, truly little reminiscent of "classic" Western capitalism in the era of its ascent, makes it possible to think that the discussion concerns some harmful phenomenon that does not deserve the stamp of capitalism as such. It is true that no one calls it socialism, and it remains to be assumed that there exists a "third" something that is basically uncertain.

The point is not that one mention of the probability of a "third path" should be considered heresy: with such an approach, the possibility of scholarly research is closed altogether. The point is that it is difficult to imagine a more or less harmonious and stable balance of two principles that is viable for any length of time: public and private ownership. In any case, in real life, not in theory. The focus can be on the first term in "state capitalism" or on the second, but in any case it is still capitalism. It can in principle be placed in the service of powers that express the interests of the workers (and then acquires a different hypostasis comparable with the NEP period of state capitalism in the Soviet Union), but in the absence of such powers a tendency toward the spontaneous development of private-property relations is inevitable.

If we put aside the specific nature of this problem in the socialist-oriented countries (this is a special and extremely important and complex topic) and turn to the countries of capitalist development, it is possible to ascertain the presence of a known symbiosis or the existence of two principles: private and state ownership. (Namely state and not public: there is a fundamental distinction herein. The full development of public principles leads to socialism, while the state trend is wholly compatible with capitalism.) The discussion does not concern conflict-free and harmonious co-existence: there exist contradictions and struggle between the state (even if it is pro-capitalist in orientation and the results of its activity) and the bourgeoisie as a class. Examples of the most developed countries, such as India and Brazil, show this quite clearly. But this does not prevent the state and the private-capital sector from co-existing. The one supplements the other, and the contradictions and collaboration are dialectically interconnected.

It should furthermore be noted that it would be incorrect to speak of capitalism in the Orient as just something planted from without or from above. Such "planting" has existed, of course; it is understandable that world capitalism is striving in every way for the affirmation of bourgeois relations in the former colonies, the ultimate inclusion of the Third World in the orbit of the capitalist economy, the reinforcement of its position as an unequal and "junior" partner and the preservation of the opportunity of its unhindered exploitation. But a spontaneous "lower" capitalism is also transpiring along with it. The class of local entrepreneurs is growing. A relatively new actor has appeared on the stage: the Asian bourgeois and the African bourgeois. What does he represent?

Several years ago, the French scholar Maurice Guernier wrote: "There are no entrepreneurs in the Third World in the genuine sense of the word. And if they exist, they either support or imitate the industrial production of the

North, or are employed in the tertiary sector, that is in commerce or the financial sphere."⁵ That is how it was, but the situation changed rapidly--of course, not everywhere, but a definite trend was quite clearly discerned. Newly minted businessmen are occupied with entrepreneurship. Gradually, "under the wing" of the state, ever newer companies and firms are appearing--chiefly, as before, in the spheres of trade, construction and services--but, and this is noteworthy, to a growing extent in the industrial sphere as well.

Thus, a new vanguard of the international financial bourgeoisie has appeared in the countries of the Arabian peninsula with, it would seem, their extremely patriarchal society whose feudal origins have no decisive significance. Today not only Arab sheiks drive around the desert in Cadillacs and lead a fast life in Monte Carlo. Thus, the well-known ARAMCO company has for the first time been headed by an Arab since 1984--Ali Naimi--and the whole administrative apparatus of the company is today more than half Arab.⁶ The segment of capitalist managers is thus growing inexorably. The old "trading houses" are being transformed into multinational enterprises; Saudi capitalist companies are acquiring stock in Chase Manhattan Bank and Occidental Petroleum, engaging in automobile collecting etc. The leading enterprise of the Saudi state sector--SABIC--long ago declared the sale of 20 percent of its stock to private ownership.⁷

Saudi Arabia is cited here simply as an example of the fact that capitalism is blazing a trail even into countries that seemed far from it only recently--in the type of economy, in the nature of the ruling class and in the overall level of "readiness" of the population. This article does not have the task of analyzing the specific features of capitalist development in specific countries--whole books are written about that. By the way, articles have appeared in AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in recent years in which the process of this development is convincingly shown.⁸ We are interested in something else here: how the growth in capitalist relations in the countries of the foreign Orient is combined with the evident absence of a "conventional" superstructure adequate for this socio-economic structure in the majority of these countries, and who has political power?

Much was given to an understanding of this issue by the deep analysis done by N.A. Simoniya in the collective work "The Evolution of Oriental Society: A Synthesis of the Traditional and the Contemporary," and especially the following positions expressed by the author: "In an absolute majority of the countries of the Orient, the national capitalist institution, by the time independence was achieved, was unusually weak to be able to fulfill independently its system-forming function. It still did not have the... "subsoil" of some formed civilian society... the modern state--parliamentary republic--borrowed from the West was an inadequate economic and social base for a national-ethnic structure or even sufficient elements for the construction of an ownership (i.e. state) apparatus. Where a state had been created... it very soon revealed the lack of correspondence of the official form of that state, as well as the modern core within the state superstructure, to the actual society over which it had been elevated."⁹ And further: "For the same reason that the dominant force in the phase of early capitalist development cannot be 'pure' representatives of any of the institutional components of the combined society remaining from colonialism,

this force should, apparently, be representatives of that social segment that has relative autonomy from all of these institutions. This segment is the bureaucracy--civilian and (or) military--and its representatives are the corresponding segments of the intelligentsia..."¹⁰

The fiasco of bourgeois parliamentarianism in Asia and Africa and the bankruptcy of an "official state" that does not correspond to the actual society of which N.A. Simoniya writes is a fact that has long been noted and does not evoke dispute (with the exception of some instances that are analyzed in the cited collective monograph, and first of all India). Africa and the Near East are the clearest examples that illustrate this phenomenon. The countries of bourgeois (more precisely, quasi-bourgeois) democracy in these regions can be counted on one's fingers. Aside from the weakness of the national capitalist institution and its "natural" representative--the local bourgeoisie--the following extremely important circumstance has also played a role here: the social structure and social traditions in the countries under consideration are notable for the as yet indelible imprint of a mosaic and diffuse nature--not so much of class traits as of ethnic, religious, sect and clan ones, and an unbelievably solid and deeply rooted system of patron-client relations holds sway here. This is even manifested in such a relatively homogeneous country in this regard as Egypt; not to mention the thoroughly separate religiosity of Lebanon or of Iraq, split almost in half into Sunnis and Shiites, or even more so the countries of sub-Saharan Africa with their ethnic diversity and the depth of tribal traditions. Clanism on a social plane and the factionality in political life associated with it decisively opposes the clear depiction of class lines and immeasurably complicates the upheavals of political struggle."¹¹

In summarizing the economic factors (first and foremost the weakness of private enterprise furthered by the inevitable creation of a powerful state sector), social factors (the traditionally heterogeneous society, the dominant role of patron-client ties) and political factors (the absence of a "civilian society" and foundations for the functioning of bourgeois democracy, alien in spirit to traditional ideological institutions and behavioral stereotypes), we should come to the conclusion that the inability of the bourgeoisie to become a class-hegemonist and concentrate political power in its hands was a wholly consistent and natural phenomenon. And, evidently, the combination of the indicated factors, in fact creating a serious obstacle to the development of capitalist relations, did facilitate the appearance of the idea among many that this development had entered a dead end altogether and was being suffocated. But, as was said above, this conclusion was premature and too optimistic. A certain involuntary substitution of concepts occurred.

Let us turn to the state sector, for example. Does its powerful development in and of itself really speak of the fragility and unsteadiness of the process of dissemination of capitalist relations? As early as 1979, K.N. Brutents justly noted the onesidedness of such a conclusion and wrote: "The appearance of a quite strong segment whose interests are closely linked with the capitalist perspective in and of itself does not weaken the regime oriented toward this perspective at all."¹² By this "strong segment" the author had in mind the rapidly swelling "bureaucratic-technocratic segment" on the basis of the state sector, which has its contradictions with the entrepreneurial

bourgeoisie. These contradictions remain, but the overall development prospects are nonetheless not undermined and not eliminated; the possibility of compromise between the entrepreneurial (or, as it was customary to call it, the "national") bourgeoisie and the bureaucratic (sometimes called the "state") bourgeoisie exists within the framework of the state capitalist system.

The traditional heterogeneity and mosaic nature of society, serving as a brake on the process of political ascent of the bourgeoisie and its monopolization of power, in and of itself does not, however, hinder the growth of the "lower" capitalism discussed above. After all, the petty bourgeoisie, exceedingly numerous and growing continuously, is also a bearer in principle of bourgeois and private-ownership relations, and in a number of cases the pre-capitalist segments also enter onto the path of entrepreneurship (recall Saudi Arabia once again). K.N. Brutents, in the above-cited work, noted: "The bourgeoisie frequently has to 'share' power with pre-capitalist and petty-bourgeois groups. In other instances, also not rare, the power is entirely in the hands of these groups, and they, even though leading matters in practice toward the dissemination of private-ownership capitalist relations in their countries and in that manner acting historically in the interests of the bourgeoisie, sometimes have a hostile attitude toward it."¹³

It is very important, in my opinion, to emphasize this crucial moment: the petty-bourgeois, "bureaucratic-technocratic" forces and the bureaucratic and military-bureaucratic bourgeoisie or the circles of the intelligentsia representing the interests of these forces, with all of the objective contradictions in the private-enterprise bourgeoisie (and frequently with a subjective hostility toward capitalists), historically act in the interests of the bourgeoisie. More precisely, not so much in the interests of the bourgeoisie as a class, as of capitalist development as a process (albeit this should ultimately coincide).

This relates to the military in particular, whose intervention in political life was successfully avoided only by a small number of Asian and African countries. Seizing power in one country after another, the military elite is linked first and foremost with the civilian bureaucracy, the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and, in a number of cases, with entrepreneurial segments.

The objective substance of the activity of the military regimes (with the exception, naturally, of those that were established by junior and middle officers inclined toward revolution) is the creation of favorable conditions for capitalist development. The establishment of these regimes in and of itself is explained by the inability of the civilian bourgeois-bureaucratic circles to ensure this type of favorable conditions. The threat of serious internal upheavals incites the upper reaches of the military, as a rule with conservative social views, to take preventive action to eliminate the bankrupt regime and in that manner save the system overall.

Subjectively these generals are possibly no more concerned for the interests of specific capitalists than, for example, Louis Bonaparte was thinking of the needs of the French peasantry, in whose interests he objectively acted, however, as K. Marx demonstrated. Historically these same generals,

"squeezing" democracy and threatening leftist forces and providing the "stability and order" essential for private-enterprise activity with the aid of an iron fist, and finally resorting to foreign capital, creating a suitable "investment climate" for it, act in the interests of capitalist development. And the contradictions therein between Suharto or Zia ul-Haq, on the one hand, and the local major capital, on the other, and the reluctance of the military-bureaucratic corporations to allow immediate and authentic representatives of this capital to come to power, seem secondary.

The military in and of itself does not serve any particular class, and it is concerned with its own interests (including the interests of its own corporative enrichment), but under the protection of its shield bourgeois elements gradually gather force. An analogous situation exists with non-military authoritarian regimes, for example in Iran, where a unique populist-theocratic system has been established in which the ruling clergy, forming an oligarchy, plays the role of a distinctive "spiritual bureaucratic corporation." In this regard, it is impossible to agree with A.S. Arabadzhyan, who asserts that the "Shiite theologians" in Iran have become "the servants of major capital."¹⁴ In reality, the ayatollahs and mullahs serve no one, although they are moving, as the same author correctly notes, "in the direction of capitalist principles of running the economy." They are creating favorable conditions for the activity of private enterprise, but are decisively retaining their monopoly on power.

The question consists of something else: how long can a state-capitalistic "model" exist within whose framework the bourgeoisie is gathering force and moving toward transformation into an economically dominant class, while political power is monopolized by a bureaucratic and technocratic corporation (military, civilian, "spiritual"—it is not so important in any case if it is authoritarian or even despotic). K. Marx wrote that the bourgeoisie "feeds the aversion to military despotism."¹⁵ F. Engels noted: "The bourgeois cannot ensure his own interests without immediate and constant control over the central administration, foreign policy and legislation of his state," "...the bureaucracy that the petty bourgeois needs soon becomes unbearable fetters for the bourgeois."¹⁶ Finally, V.I. Lenin pointed out that "normal capitalist society cannot develop successfully without a consolidated representative structure."¹⁷

These statements of the classical authors of Marxism-Leninism leave no doubt of the fact that they considered unrepresentative—that is non-parliamentary, bureaucratic and military despotic—regimes a temporary and abnormal phenomenon from the point of view of the interests of the bourgeoisie. A developed and solidified bourgeoisie tends toward the establishment of a "representative structure," that is toward a bourgeois-democratic form of rule, only under which they may fully control the policies of the government, determine its direction and keep the levers of power in their hands, know in advance what the government intends to undertake, be confident of the safety of their capital etc. An autonomous, uncontrollable, unpredictable and willful bureaucracy does not let the bourgeoisie feel itself to be the master of the situation. Is not the decline of the military dictatorships in Brazil and Argentina connected with this, where the bourgeoisie, which had possibly already ceased (under conditions of the absence of a strong threat "from the

left") to feel satisfied by a situation under which the military clique, encouraging the economic activity of the capitalists, "pushed them away" from the direct levers of political power? And can these examples not be considered manifestations of a tendency which will make itself known with time on the other two continents of the Third World? If this is so, then the discussion evidently can proceed only on an extremely long-range perspective: after all, even guided by the criterion that was advanced above, that is the maturity of the bourgeoisie and its readiness to hold political power (and this criterion is far from being the only one), we should acknowledge that the overwhelming majority of the Asian and African countries are still far behind the most developed Latin American ones. Moreover, time does not wait and problems accumulate. The future of the countries now proceeding along the capitalist path is sooner fraught with such difficulties and conflicts, in which new chances will appear for the activity of revolutionary forces that renounce the capitalist alternative overall and are beyond dependence on its varieties and nuances.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 10 Jul 79. See also A. Knyazev. "Egipet posle Nasera (1970-1981)" [Egypt after Nasser (1970-1981)]. Moscow, 1986, pp 10-13.
2. It seems that it is time to return the term "non-capitalist path" to its genuine initial meaning--a special route toward socialism for countries where there is not or almost is not capitalism, a path that permits the bypassing of capitalism. That is namely how this phenomenon was understood at the 2nd Comintern Congress, where V.I. Lenin formulated the concept of transition to socialism for backward countries, bypassing the capitalist stage of development. This term later came to be treated in broader fashion. In Egypt, Syria and other countries by the time of the proclamation of socialist orientation, moreover, a quite strong and developed capitalism already existed.
3. V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 43, p 222.
4. States where national-democratic power has been established are not what is in mind here (as, for example, Ethiopia).
5. M. Guernier. Tiers-monde: trois quarts du monde. Paris, 1980, p 26.
6. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 12 Dec 83.
7. SOUTH, January 1983, pp 9, 10, 11.
8. See, for example, the articles of V. Chernovskaya "Nigeria: Entrepreneurial Organizations in Political Life (1984, No 2), A. Yuryev "Indonesia: Social Changes and Political Struggle" (1986, No 10) and others.
9. "The Evolution of Oriental Societies: A Synthesis of the Traditional and the Modern." Moscow, 1984, p 275.
10. Ibid., p 277.
11. By the way, this is also noticeable in a number of socialist-oriented countries, where political power does not conquer ancient traditions so easily: the events in South Yemen in January of 1986 testify to this.
12. K.N. Brutents. "Osvobodivshiesya strany v 70-ye gody" [The Liberated Countries in the 1970s]. Moscow, 1979, p 37.
13. Ibid., p 39.
14. AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 4, 1986, p 21.

15. K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, Vol 12, p 43.
16. Ibid., Vol 4, pp 48, 57.
17. V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 20, p 68.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821
CSO: 1807/276

MULTI-NATIONAL CORPORATIONS' TYPES OF 'EXPLOITATION' OUTLINED

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 pp 36-38

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Shitov under the rubric "The Economist's Forum": "New Forms of Expansion for the Multinational Corporations"; first paragraph is source introduction]

[Text] "It can be asserted without exaggeration," says the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress, "that the system of imperialism is continuing to live to a considerable extent through robbing the developing countries." Naturally, modern capitalism, as emphasized in the new edition of the CPSU Program, is largely different from how it was at the beginning and even in the middle of this century. One of the direct results of capitalist concentration and the internationalization of production is a strengthening of the multinational corporations [MNC], extracting enormous profits by way of exploiting the workers on a worldwide scale. Encountering rejection on the part of young states, the monopoly bourgeoisie continues to maneuver. The mechanism of exploitation is becoming more complex and refined. Some of its new forms are reviewed in the article published below.

The last two decades, especially the second half of the 1970s, have been noteworthy for an activation of the struggle of the developing countries to affirm national sovereignty over their natural resources and gradually to extract foreign monopoly capital from the key sectors of the economy and strengthen state control over their development. Many Afro-Asian states nationalized the property of this or that imperialist monopoly, legislatively limited the sphere of direct foreign investment in secondary sectors of the economy and began to regulate the activity of the MNCs on their territory.

The participation of the MNCs in the capital of the extraction industries of the countries under consideration was altered most appreciably. For example, whereas in 1973 seven major oil MNCs (Exxon, Mobil, Texaco, Socal/Chevron, Gulf, Shell and British Petroleum) obtained some 82 percent of the oil they imported from these young states from enterprises they capitalized, by 1981 this indicator totaled only 17.5 percent. At the same time, only 21 percent of the aggregate volume of copper production in the non-socialist world, compared to 34 percent in 1970 and 60 percent in 1960, fell to the seven leading copper MNCs (Kennacott Copper, Anaconda, Fells Dodge, Rhone-Amc Group, Anglo-American Group, Union Miner and International Nickel).

The young states tightened their control over the import of foreign capital. The research of the UN Center on MNCs, "Multinational Corporations in World Development," published in 1983, noted that in the majority of these countries, foreign capital investment was already regulated either through specially adopted laws or directly by central state organs, whose purview included evaluating the terms and nature of such investment, as well as granting permission to carry it out. A separate object of regulation in many countries is agreements with MNCs on their sale of technology. According to data of the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), about 30 young states have adopted special legislative measures for the purpose of establishing centralized control over this important sphere of international economic ties.

The changes noted in the approach of the young states to foreign monopoly capital reflect their growing understanding of the real danger of independent economic development, which entails the creation of foreign production subdivisions of an enclave type, as well as their attempts to use the powerful technological and financial potential of the MNCs to set up their own economy without, however, forgoing their own sovereign rights.

All of this has placed before imperialism the urgent task of "renewing" neocolonial strategy in the developing countries and diversifying the forms of penetration into their economies.

Currently, while far from refraining from the creation of wholly owned enterprises or jointly owned companies through direct or portfolio investments respectively in the Afro-Asian countries (these are as before the most important forms for the penetration of the foreign monopolies into the local economy), the MNCs are more and more often proceeding to the arrangement of contractual relations with the companies of the developing countries. Economic ties of this type are of interest because, as opposed to the export of capital through direct or portfolio investments, they do not lead to the creation of foreign monopoly ownership in the developing economy. This potentially reveals possibilities for their use by the liberated countries in the interests of independent economic development. It is curious, however, to note that in bourgeois economic literature, contractual relations of MNCs with the enterprises of the developing countries are called "new forms of foreign investment," and this in and of itself testifies to the fact that the goal that the monopolies are trying to achieve with their aid is a strengthening of imperialist influence over the economic processes in the young states--analogous to that which was prosecuted by the traditional export of capital.

With all of the diversity of MNC contracts with the companies of the developing countries, these agreements can be subdivided into two principal groups according to their functional role.

The first group includes compensatory agreements, production sharing agreements and agreements for the turnkey construction of enterprises. For the MNCs, they serve in the initial stages of penetration into the economy of the young states¹ as a means of ensuring either the uninterrupted supply of

mineral and power raw materials (compensatory agreements and production sharing agreements) or a quite high level of income in the form of payments for the construction of facilities for various purposes (agreements for the turnkey construction of enterprises, which are employed, for example, in MNC practice with the oil-exporting countries).

Such agreements should be analyzed first of all from the point of view of the commercial terms for their implementation, as well as the extent of the correspondence of the technology supplied on that basis to the developing countries and the needs of the latter.

The results of analysis testify to the fact that the MNCs are deriving considerable profit for themselves to the detriment of the other contracting parties, and are making maximum use of their dominant position in the capital and technology markets in the world capitalist economy. A frequent term in the compensatory agreements of the MNCs is the receipt of up to 60 percent of the annual volume of production of the enterprise constructed by the foreign contractor, and moreover the period for such deductions can reach 25 years.

The expenses of the young states in the realization of the contracts for the construction of enterprises by MNCs on turnkey terms are exceptionally large. This associated first and foremost with the fact that the size of payments for the services of the contractor is defined, as a rule, as a percentage of the total estimated cost of the work executed, which under the effects of inflation grows steadily. Whereas, for example, expenditures for the creation of a complete production cycle for the extraction of copper ore comprised 200-400 million dollars at the beginning of the 1970s, by the beginning of the 1980s the inflationary growth in prices in the developed capitalist countries had brought these expenses to 1.5-2 billion dollars. I would add that they are, as a rule, also artificially inflated by the MNCs themselves. Research of the UN Center on MNCs, especially devoted to an analysis of the participation of multinational corporations in agreements with the young states to construct turnkey enterprises, cites an example where a developing country, instead of the initially agreed upon 100 million dollars, was forced to pay a foreign contractor about 133 million dollars for the construction of a power facility. The need for additional procurements of equipment and increased market prices for engineering and consulting services were cited by the MNC in hindsight as the reasons.

I would also note that under the indicated agreements the developing countries often get technology that does not allow for their specific socio-economic conditions and is excessively capital-intensive, which makes the solution of problems associated with the productive employment of the population of the young states more difficult and places an additional burden on their balance of payments.

The agreements under consideration, facilitating to a certain extent the development of the production apparatus of the liberated countries, thus also carry with them a large "negative charge," furthered both by the general tendency of crisis phenomena to spill over from the developed capitalist states to the developing ones along the channels of foreign economic ties and

by the neocolonialist content with which the MNCs strive to fill contract relations.

The second group includes administrative contracts and subcontracting agreements. Their chief functional purpose (along with ensuring direct commercial benefit for the MNCs) consists of reinforcing the position of foreign monopoly capital in the developing economy, while for subcontracting agreements, it is the immediate "dragging into" the industrial centers of world capitalism.

Administrative contracts, whose sphere of application is extremely extensive, have become especially widespread. MNCs have, for example, contracts for the management of extraction enterprises in Ghana, Zaire, Nigeria and Sierra Leone, processing-industry enterprises in Cameroon and Kenya, hotels in Zimbabwe and the Ivory Coast etc.

The fact is that many of the liberated countries are encountering serious problems due to a shortage of national personnel with the essential experience and knowledge in the realm of organizing the production and marketing of products. They are often forced to turn to the former owners of nationalized enterprises for assistance in setting up and repairing equipment, acquiring spare parts and the like, the more so as the channels for their sales usually remain under the control of foreign monopoly capital. The MNCs try to make use of the objective need of the young states for administrative assistance in their own interests.

The participation of MNCs in administrative contracts is furthered through granting them the right to resolve the most important issues associated with current activity and the prospective future development of the enterprise at their own discretion. They usually receive the right of full operational control over the functioning of the given enterprise (including the replacement of equipment and the assignment and dismissal of personnel) and the right to establish economic ties with other firms, as well as to carry out current and future budget planning. The enumerated functions of the "foreign manager," although not reinforced by relations of ownership, nonetheless give him practically unlimited power over the national enterprise. Hence such "lateral results" of administrative contracts as the exclusive orientation of the enterprise to this or that market and, correspondingly, the possible decline of foreign-currency receipts, economic ties with foreign firms (for example, MNC branches) to the detriment of business contacts with other national firms, and the acquisition of equipment and technology on onerous financial terms.

The MNCs furthermore strive to include special provisions for the separate payment for each type of service in the administrative contracts. One of a multitude of examples is the agreement of Zambia and the Anglo-American Corporation on the management of enterprises in the extraction industries (which has now been annulled at the initiative of the Zambian party), in accordance with which the foreign contractor received payment separately for : a) current management of the enterprise; b) the organization of marketing; c) the acquisition of equipment and d) production planning.

As a result, aggregate income of the MNC contractors is growing sharply, sometimes even exceeding the level, as acknowledged in several bourgeois economic publications, that the MNC counted on with direct or portfolio investment in the analogous sphere of economic activity.

The foreign monopolies are thus having a substantial effect on economic processes in the young states through administrative contracts and are incidentally extracting high commercial incomes, foisting unequal terms of economic relations on their contracting parties. The activity of foreign capital herein sometimes leads to such financial entanglements of the national enterprises of the developing countries that the latter ultimately are forced to grant the status of influential stockholder in those enterprises to the monopoly contractor.

Even greater opportunities for MNCs on the plane of influencing the economic development of the young states are revealed by subcontractor agreements, employed chiefly in the processing industries. The partners of the MNCs here are usually those developing countries that have already achieved certain success on the path of technical reconstruction of their national economy.

The essence of these contracts is the fact that a certain portion of the operations of the full cycle for the production of specific goods is transferred to an enterprise by the developing countries (which enterprise is frequently formed on the basis of a nationalized branch of an MNC) which, having become a subcontractor in relation to the foreign monopoly, creates some of the aggregate value of its product. Depending on the market orientation of the MNC, the national enterprise either completes (assembly and preparation for marketing) or begins (initial processing of raw materials) the output of an item. In both cases, the subcontractor fulfills the role of a narrowly specialized supplier of certain product elements.

The ties of a number of the major automobile monopolies of the developed capitalist countries with some of the national enterprises of India, Morocco, the Philippines, South Korea etc. can serve as specific examples of subcontractor agreements in effect. The Saida Company, fully owned by Moroccan capital, is engaged on a subcontractor basis in the assembly of trucks for the Swedish Volvo MNC. Another Moroccan company--Auto-Hall, in the past a branch of the American Ford monopoly--is today also associated with it as a subcontractor. A multitude of subcontractor agreements have been concluded by the monopolies of the U.S. and Japanese electronics industries with national enterprises in Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, the Philippines and South Korea.

A specific feature of subcontractor agreements with the participation of the MNCs is the potential opportunity for the practically complete subordination of the national subcontractors to the economic strategy of the foreign monopolies, which is explained by the dominant role of the MNCs in the economic relations that arise in the realization of these agreements. The MNCs, in the first place, define the nature and scale of production of the subcontractor enterprise through the sale of technology and the supply of semi-manufactures; in the second place, they themselves control the course of production, either through inspection of the quality of the body of products

or through the commands of their representatives; finally, they concentrate the marketing of the products in their hands, determining its geographical thrust and specific markets. The subcontractor enterprise depends on the foreign partner for the fulfillment of its production functions and the delivery of the product to the ultimate consumer, and this means for the reimbursement of production expenditures as well. As a result, the reproductive process at these enterprises is fundamentally controlled by foreign monopoly capital and is subordinate to its interests.

The employment of contractual relations by MNCs is one of the ways of adapting imperialism to the changing political and economic climate in the developing countries. They use for their own purposes both the difficulties of these countries associated with the colonial past and the ambitions of their young bourgeoisie. Organized forms of international economic ties developed by world practice for mutually profitable and equal collaboration are herein transformed by monopoly capital into an instrument of discrimination, pressure and oppression. The novelty of the contemporary methods of neocolonialism is extremely relative, since it springs from the very essence of the capitalist method of production, asserting itself through the subordination of the economically weaker to the stronger.

FOOTNOTE

1. It is symptomatic in this regard that these agreements are frequently later supplemented with administrative contracts and subcontractor agreements, which I will touch on below.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821
CSO: 1807/276

BOOK ON RELATIONS BETWEEN CAPITALIST, DEVELOPING STATES

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 p 62

[Review entitled "A Crisis of Economic Relations " by Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Kovalevskiy of book "Mirovoye kapitalisticheskoye khozyaystvo i razvivayushchiesya strany Vostoka" [The World Capitalist Economy and the Developing Countries of the Orient]. Editor-in-Chief S.A. Bylinyak. Moscow, Oriental Literature Section of Nauka Publishing House, 1986, 317 pp]

[Text] Comprehensive research on the problems of including the developing states (using the example of the Orient) in the world capitalist economy (WCE) has been undertaken in this collective work of Soviet economists and Oriental scholars. The book organically combines theoretical analysis and an exposition of rich factual material on a wide circle of problems.

The chronological framework of the research is quite wide and includes both the colonial pre-history and the postwar development of the economic relations of the center and periphery of the WCE.

A study of economic neocolonialism on the WCE periphery is central to the book. The periodization of this phenomenon by the way the young states are included in the WCE and the development of the international capitalist division of labor and of world economic ties is of undoubted interest.

The work shows convincingly that in the first stage (from the beginning of the fall of colonialism to the middle of the 1960s), when the formation of a new mechanism of international exploitation was being formed, a trend toward the consolidation of the periphery as a dependent link closely connected with the centers of the WCE predominated.

The economic growth of the liberated countries increases their attractiveness as objects of exploitation by the centers of the WCE. Since the middle of the 1960s, as is justly noted in the book, a second stage in the evolution of economic neocolonialism has ensued, where the scale of international exploitation of the developing countries is increasing. In this period, a transition has begun from a colonial to a neocolonial form of international division of labor and the allocation of the "lower floors" of world capitalist production to the developing countries. At the same time, as the book notes, the pattern of export of capital to the periphery of the WCE has changed

appreciably--the share of private forms has increased and the expansion of multinational corporations and multinational banks within the framework of the reproduction of international finance capital is becoming joint.

The authors' analysis on the inclusion of the developing countries in the WCE at the beginning of the 1980s merits especial attention, especially the effect of economic crisis in the centers of the WCE on its periphery. The conclusion that "to the extent of the drawing of the developing countries into the world capitalist economy, their vulnerability to crises and spontaneous market forces in the developed capitalist world is increasing and neocolonial pressure on them is becoming stronger" (p 53) seems important and well-founded. In reality, whereas earlier the developing countries suffered the negative effects of economic recessions in the developed capitalist countries primarily as a result of a fall in the demand and prices for raw materials exported by them, in the 1980s their reproduction has also turned out to be dependent on the movement of demand at the WCE centers for the items of their industrial export, the state of the foreign-currency and credit sphere, the export of construction services, manpower etc.

At the same time, the book, written at a high professional level, evokes in the attentive reader a desire to elaborate on some of its positions. This especially concerns the theory of the privatization of foreign-currency and credit relations of the centers and periphery of the WCE. In the first chapter, this process was interpreted as growth in the share of private credit in the influx of loan capital to the developing countries and the conclusion is drawn that after the intensive stage of its development in the 1970s "privatization... will continue at moderate rates" (p 34). At the same time, in Chapter 7, devoted to the participation of the liberated countries in international foreign-currency and credit relations, privatization is considered from the point of view of changes in the extent of control of official (state, national and international) institutions over the influx of borrowed capital to the periphery of the WCE. In this case, the debt crisis of the developing world at the beginning of the 1980s becomes the turning point in the development of a trend toward privatization of the international currency system, when the sources of liquidity of the WCE periphery once again come under the control of the official institutions of the West, but this time not national ones, as before the 1970s, but international ones (p 255).

The approach to the problem of privatization of currency and credit relations in the centers and periphery of the WCE set forth in Ch. 7 of the book seems more productive. In my opinion, it especially allows an elaboration and development of the periodization of economic neocolonialism given in the book.

The lack of a conclusion in which answers to the questions posed at the beginning (p 6) could be contained in concentrated and systematic form is felt. Overall, the book occupies a notable place among the research devoted to the economic problems of the developing world.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

CSO: 1807/276

HANDBOOK ON STATE OF ISRAEL REVIEWED

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 pp 63-64

[Review entitled "Comprehensive Research" by Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Isayev of book "Gosudarstvo Izrail". Spravochnik [The State of Israel. Handbook]. Editor-in-Chief V. V. Benevolenskiy. Moscow, Oriental Literature Section of Nauka Publishing House, 1986, 279 pp]

[Text] This book, prepared by staff members of the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, contains diverse information on the state of Israel from the moment of its formation to the middle of the 1980s. The handbook devotes a special place to Zionism as the ideology and policy of the ruling circles of Israel, and the role of this state in the system of international Zionism is illuminated.

The authors have succeeded in showing that Zionism in Israel is not monolithic today. The presence of such directions as revisionist, social-Zionist and religious-political within the framework of Zionist ideology, the diversity of the social makeup and ethno-cultural features of the population, the varying time periods of immigration influxes and the like cannot help but leave their mark on the views of the adherents of Zionism. The aggression of 1982 against Lebanon had an especially strong influence on the process of polarization of the political forces in the country. I would emphasize that in this instance the discussion concerns such organizations and parties as MAPAM (the United Workers Party), RATs (Civil Rights and Peace Movement), the PSM ("Progressive List for Peace") and several others that have Zionist positions overall. Differences of opinion are also deepening, albeit on tactical issues, among the ruling circles of Israel and international Zionist organizations.

The book shows that during the rule of the Likud bloc, "noted" for the war against progressive forces in Lebanon and detachments of the Palestine resistance movement, typical were a strengthening of the positions of the ultra-rightists and even pro-fascist circles, on one hand, and an unprecedented rise in the protest movement against the policies of occupation and war as expressed in demonstrations unprecedented in scale and the creation of such antiwar organizations as "Peace Now," Soldiers against Silence, "There is a Limit" and others, on the other hand.

The requisite attention is given in the book to the Near East conflict. The authors justly point out the pivotal aspect of the conflict--the Palestinian problem--that arose "as a result of the Zionists driving the Arab people of Palestine from their ancient lands and depriving them of their national rights, first and foremost the right of self-determination and the creation of their own state" (p 63). The negative role of the United States, striving to use the military machine of Israel to suppress progressive Arab forces, is emphasized.

At the same time, the data cited in the book clearly testify to the fact that Israel has currently been transformed from a puppet to a strategic partner of the United States in the Near East, albeit a junior one, whose policies meet American interests, "insofar as its sharp edge is directed against Arab forces that are consistently waging the anti-imperialist struggle" (p 90). At the same time, the book proves convincingly that without a regard for the positions of the socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union, there is not and cannot be a just solution to the Near East problem.

The book considers in detail the complex and largely contradictory processes of the Zionist colonization of Palestine and the policy of the Israeli ruling circles in relation to the immigrants from the countries of the Orient and the Arab population of Israel in the channel of orienting them toward the accelerated capitalist development of the country. It is justly noted that Jewish immigrants from the countries of the Orient and the Arab population of Israel, with clearly unequal positions in relation to other citizens, play an important role in supplying agriculture, industry and the infrastructure with cheap manpower.

The handbook gives serious assistance to scholarly workers, propagandists, staff members of practical organizations and all of those interested in the problems of the Near Eastern countries. I would note only that the publication would gain by uncovering some of the specific features of the statistics and methodology of the calculations done for Israel.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821
CSO: 1807/276

TWO BULGARIAN BOOKS ON ARAB SOCIETY, RELIGION REVIEWED

Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 3, Mar 87 p 64

[Review entitled "Social Movements and Religion in the Arab World" by Candidate of Historical Sciences N. Yonkov (Bulgaria) of the books "Istoriya i filosofiya odnoy religii" [The History and Philosophy of One Religion] and "Sovremennyy arabskiy mir" [The Modern Arab World] by Yordan Peyev, Sofia, Partizdat Publishing House, 1985, 228 and 206 pp respectively]

[Text] In their theoretical and practical activity, the scholarly colleagues of Bulgaria are based on the achievements of Soviet Oriental studies. The problems raised in these books of Yordan Peyev are largely resonant with problems raised in Soviet Oriental studies, but they have their own ring and thus merit attentive consideration.

The author tries to overcome the competing treatments and subjective conclusions of bourgeois science relating to a number of processes and crucial events in the Arab and Muslim countries. Yordan Peyev emphasizes that "in order to understand the Arab of today, it is necessary to look at the historical past, which he is trying to 'relive again'. Nowhere is this past so persistently present as in ideology and politics" (p 7). That is why the books under review devote a considerable place to the historical development of the enormous Arab-Muslim region.

The book "The Modern Arab World" traces the dynamics of changes in the class structure of the Arab countries and the socio-political differentiation that transpired there after the achievement of independence. It is pointed out that various classes and social segments are striving to preserve the old or replace the new reigning positions, and therefore the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the working class is acquiring an ever sharper and more antagonistic nature. The petty bourgeoisie, and especially the middle-class segments of the cities and villages, are playing an ever more important role in the life of the Arab countries, and marginal groups are increasing.

In considering the most important social conflicts, Y. Peyev turns the attention of the reader to the complex processes of the formation of the working class of the region, which is growing at a strong rate--compared to other classes and segments--and already encompasses an average of 5 to 20 percent of the working population.

The book analyzes the experience of non-capitalist development in several Arab countries. The author, taking into account both its achievements and its miscalculations, concludes: "Socialist orientation in the Arab world has had its successes and revealed its contradictory nature for a number of objective reasons. The most substantive of these are rooted in the disparity between the enormous historical scale of the essential historical transformations and the extremely low level of productive forces. The revolutionary-democratic program advanced for the restructuring of society took shape under social conditions that were not ripe, and it is opposed by cultural backwardness and adherence to tradition, and neutralized by the class influence of the bourgeoisie, reactionary propaganda and the efforts of imperialism to undermine it" (p 150). This orientation has nonetheless undoubtedly "demonstrated its advantages compared to capitalist development, unambiguously confirming that this path is the real future of mankind" (p 150).

Against the background of the development of the Arab world, the author considers the appearance and activity of the communist parties. He reveals the principal moments in the positions of the communists of the Arab countries on such key issues as the attitude toward revolutionary democracy and its political organizations, the creation of national fronts, the situation in the region etc.

The book "The History and Philosophy of One Religion" researches contemporary Islam, the place and role of the religious factor in the life of the Muslim countries and its effect on the world outlook of believers. Attention is devoted to the process of modernizing Islam and borrowings from contemporary bourgeois and social thought. The Bulgarian scholar isolates the socio-political tendencies of modern Islam into several groups: traditionalists, reformists, modernists, neo-modernists, radical-progressives and neo-fundamentalists. The positions and place of contemporary Islam in socio-political life, as well as the attitude toward the principal issue of modern times--the choice of development path--are basic to this delimitation.

The author comes to the following conclusion: "The reflections of the system and concepts associated with Islam and its specific nature continue to have an effect on the objective movement of the Muslim people toward a better and more just future. And on this path they will inevitably be freed... from their hopes for the heavens, so as to accomplish more fully their real and human goals here on Earth" (p 212).

Bulgarian scholars and specialist-practitioners in problems of the modern Arab and Muslim world and a wide audience of readers has received the books of Yordan Peyev with interest. It seems that these books could also be used by the Oriental studies scholars of the fraternal socialist countries in their research work.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987
Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821
CSO: 1807/276

U.S. RIGHT-WING OFFENSIVE SMACKS OF 'MCCARTHYISM'

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 87 p 5

[Article by N. Kurdyumov: "In McCarthy's Footsteps: International Notes"]

[Text] When Herbert Block, the famous cartoonist for the WASHINGTON POST, was awarded a prize several months ago in recognition of his service in the assistance of "free speech and a free press," he devoted his speech at the ceremony to "the intensifying attacks upon freedom."

Expressing deep concern regarding the atmosphere prevailing in the country and the way of thinking of those who are striving, in his words, "to limit the basic rights of Americans," H. Block, in particular, cited a statement by attorney general Edwin Meese, who literally declared the following: "Few are held suspect who are not guilty of a crime. If a person is not guilty of a crime, he would not be suspected" (!)

Similar views of the "guardian of American law," one should think, would have delighted Joseph McCarthy himself, who unleashed an unbridled campaign of repression and persecution of "dissidents" in the early 1950s in the U.S.

Many in the U.S. today share Herbert Block's alarm and apprehension in connection with the offensive of extreme right-wing forces against the democratic rights of broad strata of Americans. Moreover, people, especially of the older generation, are perceiving, not without grounds, ominous parallels in the present tendencies in the country's political life with the era of McCarthyism, with a period in which the Republican senator from Wisconsin, in carrying out the social demand of reaction, announced a "crusade" against communism and began the repression and persecution, sanctioned by the authorities, of progressive activists and organizations which spoke out against the arms race and the "cold war."

The manifestations of the anti-communist hysteria of those years--blackmail, threats and intimidation, hunts for "secret communist agents," tests of loyalty, inquisitorial investigations in committees of Congress and as a result, reprisals against the leadership of the Communist Party and the corrupted fates of thousands of people--were forever imprinted upon the memory of older Americans.

Slightly over 3 decades have passed since the time that McCarthy, having become the personification of one of the most infamous pages of American history, was removed from the political scene. However, America's politicians condemned him not at all for his "principles," but for faulty tactics, for imprudence. He had become dangerous even to their own ultra-right confederates. This is why, even now, McCarthyism has been preserved as a method for suppressing dissidence, in different, more refined and camouflaged forms, although McCarthy himself has disappeared.

As in the 1950s, once again reactionary forces are counting on arousing an anti-communist psychosis and frightening the population with the "Soviet threat," to create the appropriate climate for open repressions against the broad anti-war, democratic forces. The authorities have lifted limitations on the activity of the CIA and other special agencies within the United States, and have expanded the apparatus for spying on Americans. According to information from the American press, during the present administration the number of "official" authorizations for the FBI to install listening devices in the apartments of Americans and in the offices of "unreliable" organizations has more than doubled, and tens of thousands of employees of the department of justice, the department of finances, the immigration services and military officials, along with 20,000 FBI agents, are constantly busy with "the exercise of police functions, the gathering of intelligence, and investigations." In the 1950s, the struggle against "subversive organizations" served as a screen for the persecution of dissidents; today their persecution is being carried out under the slogan of "the struggle against terrorism." America's present-day reality is the broad use by the authorities of so-called "lie detectors" to test the loyalty of employees and the hundreds of political prisoners, who are serving long prison terms for their political beliefs, for participating in anti-war demonstrations and for criticizing state institutions, in defense of democratic rights and freedoms.

The creation on the Republican administration's initiative in 1981 of a Senate subcommittee "on security and terrorism," which has replaced the notorious House of Representatives Commission for the Investigation of Anti-American Activities, was an ominous reminder of the dark times of McCarthyism. Then the secret White House directive concerning the implementation of project "Rex-84," which stipulates the forced building within U.S. territory of ten gigantic concentration camps guarded by troops in the country's various states, also became known. From materials which had fallen into the hands of the magazine STARLIGHT, it is clear that repressive measures within the framework of the project are intended to be applied to a very broad range of people--political protesters of the system, who are criticizing the government, so-called "illegal immigrants," and all those whom the American secret police "considers dangerous" for some reason or another.

As to how this is being done, the arbitrariness committed not long ago upon a Palestinian, H.M. Hamid, by the authorities is indicative. Several years ago he came to America as a student, set himself up with a family and a job, and considered living forever in Los Angeles. However, one day, early in the morning, FBI and U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service agents burst into his apartment, conducted a search, and then threw him and his wife in jail. The keeping of "forbidden" literature served as formal grounds for the arrest.

On this basis, the authorities accused the prisoners of "subverting the state foundations" of the U.S. and demanded their deportation. The real reason for Hamid's persecution lies in the fact that he openly expressed disagreement with the Reagan administration and spoke out for a just solution to the Palestinian problem.

The newly appearing McCarthyists are obviously striving to surpass the raving senator. At the height of McCarthyist hysteria, frightened State Department officials were forced to burn the books of progressive authors in embassy libraries abroad; now obscurantists are advocating censorship, particularly in schools, of textbooks, books, plays, and movies you can watch at home. The matter has gone to the point that the reactionary army, in the guise of a right-wing research organization, the "Heritage Foundation," has demanded the removal of the books, periodicals and scientific publications of socialist and a number of developing countries, even from the United Nations library.

Really, are the prejudice and arbitrariness of official authorities in their attitudes toward "undesirable" foreigners, including those from socialist countries, in whose way they are setting up, as a rule, any sort of obstacle for entry, not an echo of McCarthyism? The broad use for these purposes of the notorious McCarran-Walter act, passed in 1952, is direct evidence of this.

Not long ago, the NEW YORK TIMES newspaper noted in an editorial that "the spirit of McCarthy is living in the McCarran-Walter immigration act." It is public knowledge that, as a result of the use of this act, many thousands of foreigners have been refused entry to the U.S. According to UPI data, the names of over 40,000 citizens of many countries appear on the "blacklists" of undesirable and suspicious persons. The recent State Department decision to deny entry visas to two journalists from the Soviet Press Agency, Novosti, on the quite ridiculous pretext of their allegedly possible participation "in subversive activity"--the routine depiction of the trampling of basic international standards in the area of human rights.

Recently, official Washington acquired yet another lever for the struggle against the importation of "harmful ideas" into the United States from abroad. The Supreme Court allowed the administration at its own discretion to declare foreign films "political propaganda" and forbid their showing in the country. This specific decision has already been made concerning three Canadian films. One of them appeals for protecting the Earth against nuclear annihilation. The other two concern the destruction of forests and waterways in North America as a result of acid rain. Thus, step by step, the true worth of the pretty declarations by Washington's leaders about devotion to the "ideals of democracy" is being revealed.

13362

CSO: 1807/309

WEST GERMAN, ARMENIAN CITIES ESTABLISH TIES

Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 6 May 87 p 3

[Armenpress item: "Yerevan-Wiesbaden: Partnership Ties Set in Motion"]

[Text] The first meeting of partner-cities of the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany took place in the West German city of Saarbrücken with delegations from 24 Soviet cities taking part. Also taking part were representatives of "FRG-USSR" and "USSR-FRG" societies and the Association for Soviet and Foreign City Relations.

Representing the capital of our republic at this meeting were the Deputy Chairman of the Yerevan City Soviet Ispolkom, E. G. Mdivanyan and the Chairman of the Armenian Republican Committee for the Defense of Peace, Vice-President of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, G. A. Galoyan.

The center of attention for the representatives of the two countries was the question of the role of city partnership relations in the development of mutual understanding and cooperation between the people of the USSR and West Germany in the interests of peace and the prevention of war. Questions of environmental protection, planning and urban construction were also discussed at the meeting.

E. G. Mdivanyan provided these impressions of the trip: The condition and prospects for relations between Soviet and West German cities were considered in an atmosphere of business-like cooperation and frankness. As a result, a communique was signed in which it is noted that partnership links between cities of our two countries make possible wide-ranging public contacts which facilitate the elimination of distrust between our peoples, strengthening the cooperation and the mutual understanding of people in the interest of maintaining peace.

In particular, the communique emphasized that the contemporary international situation requires the acceptance of extraordinary measures in order to break the vicious circle of the arms race. The threat of the transfer of weapons into space and the continuing testing of nuclear arms are of particular concern.

The representatives of the city-partners also noted that the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States in Reyjavik, and the subsequent peace proposals put forward by M. S. Gorbachev have brought the matter of nuclear disarmament to a qualitatively new position. They expressed the hope that the persistent measures for a radical reduction or total liquidation of nuclear weapons will in the end provide positive results. Hence, the attendees welcome the new step taken by the Soviet Union directed towards the liquidation of intermediate range missiles in Europe, and urge that this problem be rapidly solved.

After the meeting the attendees departed to their partner-cities. The envoys from Yerevan visited Wiesbaden, the capital of the state of Hesse. This is one of the oldest German cities with which there have already been contacts for a number of years. This is where the protocol on deepening relations and developing a partnership between Yerevan and Wiesbaden was worked out.

Mdivanyan noted that the leaders of the Wiesbaden magistrate met the delegation with warmth and friendliness. They were introduced to the municipal economy, public catering, commercial and cultural enterprises, construction workers and new sanitation facilities. During the discussion, a wide circle of questions was touched on, questions which may be solved during the further development of the partnership between our cities, including exchanges involving tourists, students, school children, scientists and specialists.

Interesting and useful work in strengthening and developing the partnership links between Yerevan and Wiesbaden lies before us.

13376

CSO: 1807/326

SWISS-SOVIET TRADE DECLINE, PROSPECTS

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 7-14 Jun 87 p 7

[Text] The SEABECO GROUP, a Swiss company with branches in many countries, appeared on the Soviet market a mere five years ago, but has already established promising business contacts with many Soviet organizations. In 1985 the company's turnover in trade with the USSR exceeded 150 million dollars. At the close of last year the SEABECO GROUP received an accreditation with the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade.

Despite the obvious successes Boris Birshtein, Chairman of the Group's Board, is not pleased with the existing state of affairs. He said:

"In 1986 the firm's trade turnover with the Soviet Union dropped to 40 million dollars and we have not yet signed a single contract for the current year."

Q: What's the matter? Why has the trade turnover begun to fall?

A: I think that this situation is typical not only of our firm, but also of many others. The explanation is that today the Soviet Union has in actual fact applied the brake on many projects. Let us assume that only yesterday it was planned to build an enterprise in the USSR with the use of Western equipment and technology. Today, however, the Soviet organizations take a different look at this project: it is possible to wait and not be in a hurry--it is perhaps more advisable to set up such an enterprise in common with a Western partner. This will be more profitable because part of the investment will be made by the foreign firm, which will also bring in its know-how and technology, whereas the enterprise, besides meeting the requirements of the Soviet market, will also receive hard cash in future by exporting part of its finished products. This, I believe, is a very logical and economic approach.

Q: Soviet enterprises have received the right to have an independent outlet to the foreign market. How do you appraise this as a businessman?

A: The very idea of modifying control over foreign economic ties is brilliant, I believe.

The establishment of foreign trade firms at enterprises will enable them to deal directly with foreign partners. But no instantaneous results should be

expected. After all, to be able to trade on the world market, there is a need to have personnel of high qualification. So far there are few such people at Soviet industrial enterprises. Today, specialists are being trained at the Academy of Foreign Trade, but they mainly teach theory there, whereas the real school for businessmen is practice. In this connection, our company has a businesslike proposal: to set up a trading firm jointly with a Soviet enterprise. In this case we shall be interested in reaching its Soviet staff members the techniques of conducting international trade. Let us say in a year's time they will have practicals at our enterprises in the West. In general, I must stress that the import of managerial and marketing expertise is no less important for Soviet enterprises than the import of Western equipment and technology.

Q: What is your attitude to the USSR's intention to boost its export of finished products?

A: The time has come for the world market to have not only the Soviet Union's raw materials but also its finished products.

Our firm has long been working in this direction. For instance, for several years now the Kursk knitted-goods complex has been making sporting dresses after our models, from our fabric and completing parts, which are then sold through the Beryozka shops. Let me note that the quality of the goods made by the complex corresponds to the best world samples. This year we hope to sign a two-million-dollar contract for the export of T-shirts, made at this enterprise, to the USA and Canada.

You may ask if it makes sense for the Soviet Union to manufacture garments and export them to the West at a time when Soviet consumers need them badly. I think that this is a very rational initiative. When an enterprise works for export, it assumes great responsibility for the quality of output, production deadlines and so on. As a result, the enterprise gets used to working at a high level, and it can use the foreign currency obtained through export to raise its technical level, modernize equipment and increase the volume of production so as to supply high quality goods to the domestic market as well. If this practice is extended to many enterprises of your country, I think that in the next few years it will be possible to buy freely in the Soviet shops all those goods which are still in short supply.

Q: The restructuring of any activity is accompanied by natural difficulties and the emergency of new problems. Have you felt any of them?

A: I have noticed that there are people who try to arrest the incipient change. Their stand can be easily explained: they are used to living in a different way, in the past they felt comfortable, but now they are required to think more, to improve quality and to be more efficient in decision making. I do not want to give any concrete names--it does not become a businessman to behave like that. Nor can one article solve this problem: all the people cannot be replaced at once, they must themselves come to understand that it is no longer possible to work under the old scheme.

I am an optimist and believe that the incipient process cannot be halted, that in five years the Soviet Union will rise to a qualitatively new stage--life itself is leading us towards this.

BRIEFS

NEW AVTOEKSPORT CENTER IN BUDAPEST--Budapest. A new spacious technical and commercial center for the Soviet Foreign Trade Association Avtoeksport has opened in the suburbs of the Hungarian capital. At a press conference on the occasion of the opening it was pointed out that Soviet made motor vehicles comprise 30 percent of the cars and 20 percent of the trucks in the Hungarian People's Republic. Negotiations are underway on the participation of Hungarian firms in the production of a new model Zaporozhtsa, which is currently being displayed at the Budapest International Fair with great success. B. Rodionov. [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 87 p 4]

CSO:18 25/215-P

CHINA, EAST ASIA

ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM MEETS IN TOKYO

LD281652 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 27 May 87

[Text] Tokyo, 28 May (TASS)--TASS correspondent Aleksandr Anichkin reports:

"Security and Economic Development of Asia and the Pacific" is the theme of an international conference which opened in Tokyo today. It is attended by scientists and politicians from the USSR, the USA, China, People's Korea, Japan and South Korea. The meeting was co-sponsored by the biggest Japanese newspaper YOMIURI and the U.S. George Washington University.

Addressing the conference, M.S. Kapitsa, director of the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, noted that the Soviet approach to issues of the Asian and Pacific region was based on a concept of establishing an all-embracing system of international security. The Soviet program for eliminating nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th Century is consonant to the aspirations of Asian peoples for whom security is no less important goal than for Europeans.

Japanese expert Makoto Momoi [as received] pointed to the danger of turning the Pacific into a "theatre of military operations." He called on Asian states to play a more active role in regional cooperation and a search for tackling issues of arms control. He favored the development of the dialogue and creation of an atmosphere of trust in the region.

At the same time Gaston Sigur, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, who denounced the arms race in words, called for preserving a "nuclear deterrent potential." He openly stood out against establishing nuclear-free zones in various regions, including the Pacific. He cynically called the very idea of such peace zones a mistake which could only increase the danger of a conflict.

/9738

CSO: 1812/228

USSR VIEWS INDIAN POLITICAL SCENE, SUPPORTS CONGRESS (I) PARTY

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 87 p 5

[Article by V. Skosyrev: "Complex Knot: Intensification of the Political Struggle in India"]

[Text] The political life of India is sometimes compared with the flow of the full but capricious Ganges. There is some truth in the comparison. In any case, even the first years of independence, which in general were under the sign of the consolidation of the institutions of the young state, cannot by any means be called calm.

And now, although it is still a long time before the rainy season, the Ganges, figuratively speaking, is again threatening to overflow its banks. The seriousness of the situation is shown by a resolution passed by the Working Committee of the ruling party Indian National Congress (I). The resolution stresses that the unity and integrity of India is threatened by the large-scale plan for destabilization being carried out by rightwing religious forces, which, using religion and the differences within the society, are provoking disturbances and violence. The Indian National Congress (I) and its leader Rajiv Gandhi have become the main target of this cynical campaign.

This is not the first time that the republic has faced such a challenge. But perhaps never before has the internal reaction received such massive support from outside. A characteristic fact: in Punjab, the Indian security forces discovered a secret cache of American firearms established by Sikh extremists. An investigation showed that it was transferred to India from the territory of Pakistan and purchased from Afghan bandits for money that Sikh militants obtain from robbing banks and from the extortion of peaceful inhabitants in Punjab. Thus, one sees a link between the separatists intending to split this state away from the country, having proclaimed the theocratic nation of "Khalistan" there, and the Afghan counterrevolutionaries financed and equipped by Washington.

Despite official Indian protests to the United States, England and Canada, the advocates of "Khalistan" in the West are by no means preparing to curtail their activities. At the end of April, they even assembled a crowd in London that they pompously called the "International Congress of the Sikh Community." Taking part in it were not only the Punjab separatists but also

representatives of other anti-Indian organizations such as, for example, the "Front for the Liberation of Kashmir." And their supporters in the West are obviously not at all bothered by the fact that the hands of the "freedom fighters" are stained with the blood of completely innocent Indians.

We recall that 2 years ago an Air India passenger plane went down over the Atlantic as the result of sabotage. Last month in the United States, extremists put an explosive device on an airliner of the same company (fortunately, it was discovered in time). But even this crime did not cause American justice to take energetic action. As the Indian press wrote, FBI agents reported that an investigation will hardly lead to the arrest of the guilty.

By no means does the Punjab problem boil down to the problem of foreign interference in Indian internal affairs. Conflicts within the Sikh community are also being felt. Because of them, the position of the local government headed by S. Barnala of the Sikh faith remains shaky. Although perhaps not decisively and consistently enough, the chief minister of the state is trying to remove the stain of terrorism from the face of this most prosperous agricultural region in the country. He is being helped in this by the central government, which, in trying to isolate the extremists from the bulk of the Sikh population, is not emphasizing military force but a political settlement of the crisis.

As it turned out, however, such a turn of events did not please either the militant adherents of "Khalistan" or the religious orthodox. Five high priests recently declared the chief minister excluded from the Sikh community for refusing to submit to their will and for "deviations" from the precepts of the religion. Despite the expectations of the reaction, this did not lead to the fall of the government of S. Barnala in the legislative assembly. But neither did it help, of course, in restoring stability in the state, where 600 people died at the hands of militants over the last 2 years.

To be sure, the tension reigning in those regions of India adjacent to Pakistan somewhat reduced the reciprocal withdrawal of troops from the border in accordance with an agreement between the two states. This was a bold step confirming that neither of the sides is striving for a direct confrontation. But it is still a long way to detente on the subcontinent. And the reason for this is primarily in the fact that Washington is striving to keep Pakistan in its orbit not only as a staging area for the continuation of the undeclared war against Afghanistan but also as a lever for applying pressure to India.

This policy has already led to Islamabad's coming quite close to the threshold of building its own nuclear weapon. It has the means to deliver nuclear bombs--American F-16 fighter bombers. And right now still another proposal is being reviewed on the other side of the ocean, that of leasing AWACS long-range radar targeting aircraft flown by American pilots.

It is not surprising that in India they are following the rearmament of Pakistan with concern. Reflecting the opinion of influential circles, the TIMES OF INDIA warns: in acquiring its own bomb, the Pakistani military regime will dominate in the region. As for the official reaction, it can be

seen in the statement of Defense Minister K.C. Pant in parliament. "India," he said, "is reviewing its nuclear strategy in connection with the threat to its security as a result of Pakistan's nuclear program aimed at the creation of its own nuclear bomb and the decision of the United States to provide it with a long-range radar detection system."

It would seem that at the moment when the clouds over the country's borders are thickening all political parties must support the efforts aimed at strengthening the unity of the nation. Alas, it does not turn out that way in practice. A number of rightwing politicians who usually deliver jingoistic speeches and make a lot of noise about the necessity of increasing defense expenditures have now begun to act in unison with the dissenters. As you know, the Indian National Congress (I) holds more than two-thirds of the seats in the lower house of parliament. At the same time, the government of Rajiv Gandhi is only half way through its term in power as provided by the constitution. This being the situation, there is no possibility that the rightwing opposition could displace the government by legal means. This is why things have been put into motion behind the scenes; the press, controlled by big business, has initiated a campaign around the actual and imagined omissions in the actions of the cabinet of ministers of the Congress Party.

It is, in particular, a matter of Defense Ministry purchases of howitzers for the Indian Army from the Swedish firm (Bofors). Swedish radio reported that to receive this contract awarded several years ago, even before the formation of the current cabinet of ministers, (Bofors) supposedly resorted to bribery. It was announced in New Delhi that the matter will be investigated thoroughly. And if the accusations are confirmed, then the persons committing the misdeeds will be punished, regardless of the posts that they may hold. Nevertheless, the right-wing Bharatiya Janata Party and several other groupings are loudly demanding the resignation of the central government.

They are also utilizing disagreements between the prime minister and President Zail Singh to undermine the authority of the country's leaders. Back in February, the president expressed to Rajiv Gandhi his dissatisfaction with the fact that he is not being adequately informed on important questions in the work of the government. The president's letter was confidential in nature but nevertheless it reached the press. It became the subject of all sorts of rumors and things even reached the point of assertions that the head of state is thinking about dismissing the government, even though the president simply does not have such powers under the existing relationship of forces. A few days ago, Zail Singh officially refuted the rumors, thereby putting an end to the speculation.

The deputies from the Indian National Congress (I) party rightly noted that those who are raising a fuss about such incidents are hardly concerned about the interests of the country. The Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of India/Marxist condemned the attempts to depose the legal government through anticonstitutional means. This objectively establishes the conditions to ward off the pressure from the reaction, considering that the authority of communists as well as of the representatives of other leftwing parties has been growing of late. It is not without reason that the leftwing coalitions

were victorious in the elections for the legislative assemblies of the two states of West Bengal and Kerala.

The outcome of the fight, of course, will depend to a considerable extent upon how actively the country's largest political party, the Indian National Congress (I), will involve itself in the struggle. This is precisely the appeal made by Rajiv Gandhi in his speech to the members of the parliamentary group of the Indian National Congress (I). To defeat the forces of destabilization, he said, it is essential "to wage war more purposefully against poverty and social injustice. The broadest mobilization of the masses for the struggle against exploiters will be indispensable. We intend to fulfill this task."

9746

CSO: 1807/308

BRIEFS

TRADE UNIONISTS IN ALMA-ATA--A delegation from the General Trade Union of Egyptian Trade Workers, headed by the union's chairman Ahmed Mahmoud Mohammed Yakub, is visiting Alma-Ata from 9 to 12 April. They arrived in the USSR at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Workers in State Trade and Consumer Cooperatives. A meeting was held at the republic committee of the State Trade and Consumer Cooperative Workers' Trade Union. The delegation learned about the work of the Central Department Store and its trade union activists, visited the city market and the "Kover" [Carpet] store and the sanatorium of the Kazakh Consumer Union "Zhetysa" where they spoke with doctors and patients. [Excerpt]
[Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 87 p 3]

CSO: 1807/337

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

DEPUTY MINISTER ADAMISHIN EXPOUNDS SOVIET POLICY ON AFRICA

PM261512 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 87 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.L. Adamishin by B. Pilyatskin: "Africa, Ourselves, and the Modern World"--date, place of interview not stated]

[Text] [Pilyatskin] Anatoliy Leonidovich, the ancient Roman historian Pliny the Elder said that there is always something new out of Africa. What new features of the African continent's life can we speak of today, when political liberation has become a reality for 50 of its states?

[Adamishin] I admit I haven't a very clear idea what Africa was like in Pliny's day. Africa today, a vast seething continent, presents a complex and multifaceted picture. But there is something general that enables us to draw a conclusion on the new stage which practically all the African countries have entered: The center of gravity of today's problems is in the economic sphere. Overcoming backwardness, tribalism, in many cases poverty and starvation, and attempts at neocolonization by the West, which have even intensified recently, is a very difficult task. Perhaps no less difficult than the winning of political independence.

For the most part the colonial roots were not and, for historical reasons, could not be fully eradicated. Now they have begun to sprout again, more in some places, less in others. How can the legacy of the past most rapidly be overcome? Africa itself must give the final answer to this question. Some countries have chosen the path of socioeconomic transformations, others continue to follow in the wake of the former metropolitan countries. Those who have embarked on the progressive path of development are meeting with especially fierce resistance. The most diverse means are used--from economic pressure and blackmail to the financing and arming of counterrevolutionary gangs like the anti-Angolian UNITA [National Union for the total Independence of Angola] and the MNR [Mozambique National Resistance] in Mozambique, as well as direct armed interference.

As for the new political features of the continent's life, I would mention the African countries' increasingly clear awareness of their place in the modern world and their involvement in the events taking place in the world. Recently the "equal responsibility" thesis could still be heard in Africa. This states that the United States and the Soviet Union are to blame in an identical

degree for the arms race. And in general that since small countries cannot influence the rivalry between the two giants, there is no point in going into these problems or studying them.

Today many features--let me note among the most important the voting at the United Nations and the summit conference of nonaligned states in the Zimbabwean capital, Harare--testify that people in Africa, as well as on other continents, are defining clearly their position of active participation in the problems of our interconnected and interdependent world, and can see better "who is who" in international politics.

Characteristically, they are putting forward major initiatives of their own--on declaring Africa a nuclear-free zone, on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. In a word, there is a growing awareness that the progressive development of the African states is objectively linked with the resolution of the cardinal problems of today. As far as one can judge, there is also growing awareness of another law: The very forces which hamper the curbing of the arms race and the lessening of tension are basically a brake on progress for the young independent countries. The war machine is necessary to capitalism in order to dominate the Third World.

[Pilyatskin] Southern Africa is still a difficult area of the continent and at the same time a dangerous seat of tension, complicating the entire international atmosphere. What, in your opinion, are the possibilities and conditions of unblocking the South African situation?

[Adamishin] Whether we are talking about Southern Africa, the Near East, Central America, or the Afghanistan situation, the line of unblocking regional conflicts by political means is a clear line defined by the 27th CPSU Congress. The Soviet Union is in favor of the conflicts which arise in various regions of the globe being resolved by political means. And in Southern Africa we do not support the thesis "the worse things are--the better." After all, this means new sufferings, new casualties, and in future the possibility of an explosion with consequences which are hard to predict.

The USSR is prepared to cooperate with all who want a political settlement not in words, but in deeds. However, the trouble is that South Africa is not prepared for such a discussion. It recognizes only strength, and it really has considerable strength (according to some calculations, the South African Army, in terms of equipment, is superior to all the armies of Black Africa put together). Strength in relation to its own people--the huge black majority--and in relation to the neighboring "front-line" states.

In these conditions the national liberation movement, in the form of the African National Congress and in the form of SWAPO [Southwest African People's Organization], has no option but to counterpose to the racist might the force of armed struggle multiplied by the desire of the vast majority of the South African population to eliminate apartheid, create a free, multiracial, democratic state in the south of the continent, and proclaim Namibia's independence. In this struggle the Soviet Union is on the same side of the barricades with the peoples who come out against racism and oppression, the "front-line" states, and all Africans.

In granting them assistance and support the USSR seeks no advantages for itself and receives no dividends other than moral ones. This position meets with understanding and recognition. This was once again stated during the recent visit to Moscow by the foreign ministers of the "front-line" states of Southern Africa and their meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

I repeat, the USSR will not remove from the agenda the need for a political settlement, and as soon as the other side is ready for this, our contribution to the elimination of this seat of tension, which poisons the atmosphere not only in the cone of Southern Africa but elsewhere too, will be constructive.

When I speak of the other side, I mean not only South Africa, but its Western sponsors too. Of course, we must not form the simplistic view that the United States or Britain commands Pretoria. The possibilities for influencing a state like South Africa are relative. Nonetheless they exist. It is with the West's blatant connivance that the granting of independence to Namibia has been shamefully delayed. But here too the Western powers do not want to impose all-embracing economic sanctions with regard to South Africa, and thus they set themselves against world public opinion.

After the May elections to the white chamber of the South African parliament--the blacks are deprived of political rights there--we are seeing a shift in favor of those who rely on strength alone. This could lead to a still greater hardening of South Africa's line. This policy, which can only be called reckless, is fraught with serious consequences for both the black and the white population. Those who are now engaged in appeasing South Africa should think about that too. I do not enjoy mentioning this, but it exists.

[Pilyatskin] People in our country are now talking about the need for new political thinking. Among the letters received by IZVESTIYA there are some in which readers ask how this thinking is manifested in the Soviet Union's approach to relations with African states.

[Adamishin] In the same way as in our foreign policy in general. First, let me note the increased dynamism of Soviet-African relations. The Soviet Union's attention toward African problems has increased considerably and political contact has been stepped up. This means visits and meetings at various levels, including the top level, interparliamentary contacts, trips by various delegations--party, trade union, women's, youth delegations. Political consultations are held regularly through the Foreign Ministry.

Let me cite my personal experience. At meetings and talks with African statesmen and politicians--in a year of this work I have been able to visit 10 countries in the region--it was pleasing to hear that in Africa, and not only in the progressive states, but also in the so-called moderate states, people know about the restructuring in the Soviet Union, express good will toward it, and wish us success. It is no exaggeration to say that there is increased support for the USSR's considerably more active struggle for the ending of the arms race and the creation of a nuclear-free, nonviolent world. After all, it is clear that in the event of the realization of our initiatives it will be possible to transfer some of the freed resources into cooperation with the developing countries.

Another aspect of the restructuring in this sphere is that we seek to take a purely realistic approach to the processes taking place on the African continent, as, incidentally, in the world as a whole. They are considerably more complex and involved than we have sometimes thought, and our conception must be strictly scientific and take all the factors into account. Such as the links with the former metropolitan countries, for instance. In expanding cooperation with African countries it is not our aim to disrupt or destroy these links. This is a reality which did not spring up yesterday and will not disappear tomorrow. We respect the choice of development path that each country makes, but we firmly insist that others also respect that inalienable right.

It is no secret that for us, establishing broad Soviet-African links is a comparatively new thing, dating from around two decades ago. I will not claim that we now have 100 percent knowledge of the realities of African life, a complex life with profound historical traditions. But there has undoubtedly been considerable progress in our understanding of these questions.

A major task in the African sphere is to increase the effectiveness of economic, scientific, technical, and cultural ties. In a number of spheres considerable experience, and not always only positive experience, has been accumulated. This requires serious study. In some spheres the results are very impressive, for instance as regards the training of national cadres. The figure of half a million Africans who have received education in the USSR or undergone professional training with our assistance speaks for itself.

To sum up, I can say without exaggeration that cooperation with many African states, above all those of progressive orientation, is gathering speed. There is considerable anti-imperialist potential in Africa. These countries march alongside the USSR and the other socialist states in the struggle to improve the international situation.

[Pilyatskin] It is African Liberation Day on 25 May. Exactly 24 years ago, in Addis Ababa, capital of Ethiopia, the OAU Charter was signed. What will Africa be like, in your opinion, when it enters the 21st century?

[Adamishin] Life is more complex than any futurology. The conflict in Southern Africa at one time appeared possible to resolve in the foreseeable future. A settlement did not appear to be too remote. Now people are again thinking in terms of not months, but years. Therefore, in speaking of Africa's future, I would put it like this: How would we like to see it on the threshold of the new millennium, on the basis of the general principles of our foreign policy course?

May it, together with all mankind, be delivered from the threat of nuclear war, and let apartheid, racism, and colonialism disappear from its face together with starvation and poverty.

/12913

CSO: 1807/339

END